The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics

Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics

VOLUME 65

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.nl/ssl

The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics

Sībawayhi and Early Arabic Grammatical Theory

Edited by

Amal Elesha Marogy

With a foreword by M.G. Carter

BRILL

LEIDEN · BOSTON
2012

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The foundations of Arabic linguistics : Sibawayhi and early Arabic grammatical theory / edited by Amal Elesha Marogy ; with a foreword by M.G. Carter.
p. cm. — (Studies in Semitic languages and linguistics; v. 65)
ISBN 978-90-04-22359-2 (alk. paper)
1. Sibawayh, ʻAmr ibn ʻUthman, 8th cent. 2. Arabic language—Grammar—History. I. Marogy, Amal.

PJ6101.S53F68 2012
492.7'5—dc23

2012007523

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.nl/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0081-8461
ISBN 978 90 04 22359 2 (hardback)
ISBN 978 90 04 22965 5 (e-book)

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The papers in this volume are a selection of the papers presented at the first Foundations of Arabic Linguistics Conference (FAL1), which was held in the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies at the University of Cambridge between 3rd and 4th September 2010. It had as its main focus Sībawayhi and early Arabic linguistic theory. I am extremely grateful to each of the authors for their contribution to this volume and for their hard work and dedication. I am privileged to be able to count them not only as colleagues but as friends.

As Chair of Faculty and a colleague, Professor Geoffrey Khan never failed to show his encouragement and support and I am deeply grateful to him.

I am greatly indebted to Professor M.G. Carter for his unfailing encouragement and his willingness to write the foreword for this volume. In fact he was the one who suggested the title of the conference.

Very warm thanks are due to Professor Harry Norris whose fatherly care and scholarship were of the greatest value. I am also indebted to Marie-Claire Daaboul for her generous financial support in organising the FAL1 Conference, and to Gerard Hill for making this manuscript a much better text. Special thanks are due to my students Charles Walker-Arnott and Thomas Crooke for their editorial suggestions and to Jasmin Lange, who oversaw the production of this book. I should like to end these acknowledgements by expressing my deepest gratitude to my family and especially to Jan, Elise and Joseph.

Cambridge
December 2011

FOREWORD

All the papers in these Proceedings are concerned with Sībawayhi to a greater or lesser extent, and it is appropriate to arrange them here not in the order of presentation but according to the degree of their focus on the *Kitāb*. We shall therefore divide them into groups, using the familiar binary scheme of *qisma ʿaqliyya* or *taqsīm*, the exhaustive dichotomy borrowed from the Greeks and enthusiastically applied in all the Islamic sciences, though conspicuously absent from the *Kitāb*. By the first *taqsīm* the papers are divided into those devoted exclusively to Sībawayhi and the *Kitāb* and those which are not, the former group comprising (in order of publication) the papers of Kasher, Noy, Hnid and Dayyeh.

The residue is subdivided into those which deal with Sībawayhi in the wider context of the development of grammar within the Arab-Islamic tradition, and those which do not, the former group containing the papers of Carter, Marogy, Giolfo, Sakaedani, and Sadan, leaving two papers in which Sībawayhi is only marginal, those of King and Khan.

There is little to be gained from summarising the contents of individual papers, but some general qualitative remarks may help to put this conference into perspective. Group One examines Sībawayhi alone, sometimes in very great detail, exploring hitherto unremarked aspects of his theory, his terminology, categories and linguistic evidence. It is always risky to make claims of completeness, but it can be safely asserted that some of the papers in this group are so data-rich that they may well have captured every item of relevant information in the corpus.

The humanities do not deal in certainties, and it will be apparent from some contributions that the lifetime of a scholarly opinion on Sībawayhi is not much more than a generation. Indeed perfect unanimity is either an impossible dream or a sign of intellectual stagnation. The mediaeval grammarians knew this well, and spent much of their energies in disagreeing with their rivals, often by relabelling or reanalysing the same old facts.

In Group Two the horizons are broader, placing Sībawayhi in the context of his grammatical legacy and reviewing his system in the light of modern theories (the boundary is too vague to support another *taqsīm*). It will become obvious how much the later grammarians owed to Sībawayhi, who remains to this day the acknowledged fountainhead of authentic data and methodological adequacy. When his ideas are measured against those

of modern Western linguistics the profundity and coherence of his analysis become clear, and his observations and conclusions compare well with our own most recent perceptions, a scientific convergence which proves no historical link, merely the truth of the old saying that great minds think alike. Another way of putting it is that the study of the *Kitāb* in the West over the last one hundred and eighty years or so (from de Sacy's *Anthologie grammaticale arabe* of 1829) has been a continuous application of the prevailing Western linguistic theories as they successively emerge, with no end in sight.

In this regard the pedagogical by-products of the *Kitāb* have their own special importance, as they illustrate the gradual simplification of theory and reduction of the range of possible patterns symptomatic of a situation where the language had not only ceased to be a mother tongue and could only be acquired artificially, but which also for religious reasons could not be allowed to evolve like a natural language.

Group Three takes us out of the *Kitāb* and into the intellectual environment in which Sībawayhi's ideas were formed. The two papers give a vivid impression of the immense vitality of the period, the watershed of the transition from informal oral contact to documented literary dependence on Greek sources.

The result is, however, three different grammars within three different cultural frameworks: in contrast to the Arabic, both the Syriac and Karaite Hebrew grammars were self-consciously non-universal, reflecting the position of those communities inside an Islamic political structure which did explicitly claim to be universal. Sībawayhi takes all this for granted: simply by describing Arabic in all its domains, religious, poetic, commercial, legal, administrative, proverbial, conversational, his grammar acquires a universality unattainable by the grammars of Hebrew and Syriac, languages which (to over-simplify) functioned largely as the religious and liturgical vehicles of a minority.

It is astonishing how sophisticated the speculations were in each of the three cultures, and there is no doubt of their common methodological ground, but their individuality and autonomy are even more striking. If the three systems were expressed as Venn diagrams, the overlap would be exceedingly small by comparison with the large areas in which they go their separate ways.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

M.G. Carter, after a D.Phil. (Oxon), taught at Sydney University (1968–85), Duke University (1985–6), New York University (1986–1996) and Oslo University (1996–2004) until retirement. Research interests are Sībawayhi and early Arabic grammatical theory, and the relationship between grammar, law and philosophy in mediaeval Islam.

Hanadi Dayyeh, BA (1994); MA (1998) is currently a Ph.D. student in the department of Arabic and Near Eastern Languages in the American University of Beirut. Her thesis concentrates on Sibawayhi in the context of Arabic historical linguistics. Her work experience in the field of teaching and researching teaching methods in Arabic language, both to native and non-native speakers, extends over 15 years. Ms. Dayyeh has produced a number of textbooks in this field.

Manuela E.B. Giolfo is lecturer in Arabic at the University of Exeter. She holds an MA in philosophy from the University of Milan, and a PhD in Arabic linguistics from the Université de Provence (France). She has taught in Italy as Adjunct Professor at the Universities of Urbino, Bergamo, Turin and Enna.

Mohamed Hnid is Lecturer at the "Institut National des langues et Civilisations Orientales", INALCO, (Sorbonne, Paris Cité). Grammarian and linguist, he is particularly interested in the question of spatial representation in Arabic through the study of prepositional space.

Almog Kasher, Ph.D. (2007) in Arabic, is Instructor at Bar-Ilan University. His main field of study is Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition.

Geoffrey Khan, Ph.D. in Semitic Languages, School of Oriental and African Studies, London (1984). Currently Professor of Semitic Philology, University of Cambridge. Elected Fellow of the British Academy in 1998 and Honorary Fellow of the Academy of the Hebrew Language in 2011. Awarded Lidzbarski Gold Medal for Semitic Philology in 2004.

Daniel King is a lecturer in Religious Studies at Cardiff University. He specialises in the thought and literature of the Christian East, and the interfaces between Greek, Syriac, and Arabic in late antiquity. He has published books on the Syriac versions of Cyril of Alexandria›s Christology and on Syriac Aristotle, and articles on aspects of Syriac philosophy and theology.

Amal Marogy, Ph.D. in Orienal languages and Cultures, University of Ghent (2007) is Lector in Arabic at the University of Cambridge. She is a bilingual Aramic-Arabic speaker. She has published a book on *Kitab Sibawayhi* (2010) and is organisor of the first two Foundation of Arabic Linguistics Conferences (2010, 2012).

Avigail S. Noy is a graduate student at the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at Harvard University. Her dissertation deals with poetics and rhetoric in the Islamic world in the 6th-7th/12th-13th centuries. Her Master's thesis, written at Tel Aviv University, studied the concept of *ištiġāl* in medieval Arabic grammatical theory, with a special focus on Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*.

Arik Sadan received his Ph.D. from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Department of Arabic Language and Literature, in 2010. During 2009–2011 he carried out a post-doctoral research project in Paris, France and Jena, Germany, focusing on Arabic manuscripts in the fields of Arabic grammar and syntax.

Haruko Sakaedani is a part-time lecturer in Arabic at TUFS, Keio University, Waseda University and Tokai University. She holds an M.A. in Teaching Arabic as a Foreign Language from the American University in Cairo and PhD in Arabic linguistics from Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFS).

PART I

SĪBAWAYHI IN THE *KITĀB*

THE TERM *MAFʿŪL* IN SĪBAWAYHI'S *KITĀB*[1]

Almog Kasher

Introduction

Modern studies of medieval Arabic grammatical tradition are always at risk of reading Western linguistic theories into the writings in question. This problem is most acute when translating grammatical terms, since there is hardly an exact one-to-one correspondence between the meanings of indigenous terms and those of Western linguistics. Modern scholars are therefore at odds over the extent to which it is desirable to translate indigenous terms to the closest equivalent Western term.[2]

In this article I will discuss the term *mafʿūl* as it appears in the earliest extant grammatical treatise in Arabic, Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*.[3] Sībawayhi's use of this ostensibly simple term is actually rather intricate, raising the question as to the level of linguistic analysis, syntax or semantics, to which this term pertains.

Two translations for this term have been suggested in modern scholarship, 'object' and 'patient'. According to the former, *mafʿūl* pertains to the syntactic, and according to the latter to the semantic level of linguistic analysis. What I would like to show in the following pages is that the term embraces both syntactic and semantic aspects, but that its syntactic component does not correspond to 'object', nor does its semantic component correspond to 'patient'. The interpretation proposed here may also throw some light on this term's origin.[4]

[1] I would like to thank Avigail Noy for her helpful suggestions.

[2] For a discussion of the various viewpoints of modern scholars on the use of Western equivalents for indigenous terms, see Y. Suleiman, *The Arabic Grammatical Tradition: A Study in taʿlīl* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999), 9–11n2.

[3] The morphological sense of the term *mafʿūl*, viz. passive participle, will not be examined here, and will be taken into account only insofar as it sheds light on its non-morphological sense.

[4] I will not discuss the possible foreign origin of the term *mafʿūl*; see C.H.M. Versteegh, *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 59–61.

1. The Syntactic Component of the Term *Mafʿūl*

The rendition of the term *mafʿūl* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* as 'object' appears already in Jahn's German translation,[5] but was refuted later by Mosel.[6] In her dissertation, Mosel shows that the term *mafʿūl* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* is not applied to just one syntactic function, the direct object, but also to the subject of verbs in the passive voice and to the objective genitive:[7]

(1) *Mafʿūl* as direct object: The sentence ضَرَبَ عبدُ الله زيداً "ʿAbdullāhi hit Zayd" is used by Sībawayhi to illustrate Chapter 10—amidst a series of chapters dealing with the categorization of verbs—entitled هذا باب الفاعل الذي يتعداه فعله إلى مفعول "this is the chapter about the *fāʿil*[8] whose verb passes over beyond it to [one] *mafʿūl*".[9] The constituent زيداً, here a direct object, is labeled *mafʿūl*.

The key-term *taʿaddin* "transitivity" (lit.: "passing over"), featuring in this title, has been extensively discussed by modern scholars.[10] Suffice it to say, with regard to the sentence in question, that it basically denotes the relationships obtaining between verbs and dependent nominals labeled *mafʿūl*. In the sentence in question, the verb ضَرَبَ engages in a *taʿaddin*

---

[5] For example, Jahn translates the sentence هذا باب الفاعل الذي لم يتعده فعله إلى مفعول (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 8, (1) ed. H. Derenbourg (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9) 1, 10, (2) ed. ʿA.S.M. Hārūn (Beirut: ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1983) 1, 33 as "Ueber des Subject, über welches die Handlung desselben nicht hinausgeht zu einem Object (d.i. über die intransitiven Verba)". G. Jahn, trans., *Sîbawaihi's Buch über die Grammatik übersetzt und erklärt* (Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1895–1900), 1.1, 13. See also A. Levin, "The Meaning of *taʿaddā al-fiʿl ilā* in Sībawayhi's *al-Kitāb*," in *Studia Orientalia Memoriae D.H. Baneth Dedicata* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979), 193–210 *passim*.

[6] U. Mosel, "Die syntaktische Terminologie bei Sibawaih" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Munich, 1975), 246ff.

[7] On 'objective genitive', see M.G. Carter, ed., *Arab Linguistics: An Introductory Classical Text with Translation and Notes* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1981), e.g. 345.

[8] Similarly to *mafʿūl*, the term *fāʿil* (lit. "doer") does not denote just one syntactic function; see Mosel, "Terminologie," 248. Here it refers to the subject of verbs in the active voice. Several suggestions regarding this term will be made in what follows.

[9] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 10, Derenbourg 1, 10/Hārūn 1, 34. The expression 'the verb of the *fāʿil*' refers to the verb in the active voice; as we shall see, the expression 'the verb of the *mafʿūl*' refers to the verb in the passive voice. What is at stake in such expressions is the identity of the constituent which functions as the subject of the verb in question.

[10] See e.g. Mosel, "Terminologie," 65–70; G.N. Saad, "Sībawayhi's Treatment of Transitivity," *al-ʿArabiyya* 12 (1979): 83–88; Levin, "*taʿaddā al-fiʿl ilā*," 193–210; H. Bobzin, "Zum Begriff der 'Valenz' des Verbums in der arabischen Nationalgrammatik," in *The History of Linguistics in the Near East*, ed. C.H.M. Versteegh, K. Koerner, and H.-J. Niederehe (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1983), 93–108; J. Owens, *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988), 167ff.; Z.A. Taha, "Issues of Syntax and Semantics: A Comparative Study of Sibawayhi, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarraaj" (Ph.D. thesis, Georgetown University, 1995).

relationship with زيدًا. This, needless to say, has to do with the *ʿamal* (grammatical operation) which the verb exerts here: the verb, according to this chapter, assigns the *fāʿil* the independent, and the *mafʿūl*, here زيدًا, the dependent case.[11]

(2) *Mafʿūl* as subject: The title of Chapter 9—also in the same series of chapters about the 'transitivity' (*taʿaddin*) of verbs—reads: هذا باب الفاعل الذي لم يتعده فعله إلى مفعول والمفعول الذي لم يتعد إليه فعل فاعل ولا تعدى[12] فعله إلى مفعول آخر "this is the chapter about the *fāʿil* whose verb does not pass over beyond it to a *mafʿūl*, and about the *mafʿūl* which a *fāʿil*'s verb does not pass over to it, nor does its [own] verb pass over beyond it to another *mafʿūl*".[13] The first part of this title refers to sentences such as ذَهَبَ زيدٌ "Zayd went away",[14] whereas the second refers to e.g., ضُرِبَ زيدٌ "Zayd was hit", in which the constituent زيدٌ—the subject—is labeled *mafʿūl*.[15] In this chapter, Sībawayhi puts this *mafʿūl* on a par with the *fāʿil*, in that both take the independent case due to the grammatical operation (*ʿamal*) of the verb. This applies also to Chapter 14, which deals with constructions such as كُسِيَ عبدُ الله الثوبَ "'Abdullāhi was clothed in the garment",[16] and accordingly its title is هذا باب المفعول الذي تعداه فعله إلى مفعولٍ "this is the chapter about the *mafʿūl* whose verb passes over beyond it to [one] *mafʿūl*";[17] after comparing these constructions with ضُرِبَ عبدُ الله "'Abdullāhi was hit" with respect to the grammatical operation (*ʿamal*) exerted on the subject, Sībawayhi labels the verbs in question فعل مفعول هو بمنزلة الفاعل "a verb of a

---

[11] As we shall see below, for Sībawayhi, verbs do not engage in 'transitivity' (*taʿaddin*) relationships with the space/time qualifier (*ẓarf*), its dependent case being accounted for by means of the so-called '*tanwīn-naṣb* principle'. As we shall also see, constituents conveying the meaning of a *ẓarf* may behave syntactically as *mafʿūl*s (i.e. they may be 'objectivized', as a case of *saʿat al-kalām* "latitude of speech"), and it is only then that a *taʿaddin* relationship obtains between them and their verbs. Hence, the category of *mafʿūlāt/mafāʿīl* of later grammarians (a general category embracing not only the direct object but also other functions such as the *ẓarf*; see Z.A. Taha, "*mafʿūl*," in *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, ed. K. Versteegh et al. [Leiden: Brill, 2008], 3, esp. 100–101, 104–5, and the references therein) does not exist in the *Kitāb*.

[12] Hārūn's edition reads: ولم يتعده.

[13] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 9, Derenbourg 1, 10/Hārūn 1, 33.

[14] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 10/Hārūn 1, 33.

[15] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 10/Hārūn 1, 34.

[16] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 14, Derenbourg 1, 14–15/Hārūn 1, 41–43.

[17] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 14, Derenbourg 1, 14/Hārūn 1, 41. In a similar vein, chapter 15, dealing with constructions such as نُبِّئْتُ زيدًا أبا فلان "I was informed that Zayd is the father of so-and-so", bears a title commencing with the words: هذا باب المفعول الذي يتعداه فعله إلى مفعولين ... "this is the chapter about the *mafʿūl* whose verb passes over beyond it to two *mafʿūl*s ..." Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 15, Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 43.

maf'ūl which has the same status as the *fā'il*",[18] i.e. by virtue of its functioning as the subject, thereby taking the independent case.[19] He also remarks in this chapter that the form (*lafẓ*) of the *maf'ūl* functioning as a subject is the form of the *fā'il*.[20] These statements emphasize, on the one hand, the parity between these two types of subject, yet, on the other hand, they reflect the markedness of the *maf'ūl* functioning as a subject.[21]

(3) *Maf'ūl* as objective genitive: Sībawayhi asserts that the oblique nominal, referring in the case in question to an objective genitive, behaves just like the dependent nominal, viz. as a direct object. First, he discusses two possible parsings of the objective genitive when the annexed noun is a verbal noun (*maṣdar*): in the sentence عَجِبْتُ من دفعِ الناسِ بعضِهم ببعض "I was astonished at causing the people to repel each other", the objective genitive الناسِ is a *maf'ūl*,[22] this sentence corresponding to the sentence دَفَعْتُ الناسَ بعضَهم ببعض "I caused the people to repel each other";[23] in a similar vein, in the sentence عَجِبْتُ من دفعِ الناسِ بعضِهم بعضًا "I was astonished at the people's repelling each other", الناسِ is a *fā'il*,[24] this sentence corresponding to دَفَعَ الناسُ بعضُهم بعضًا "the people repelled each other". The oblique constituent, Sībawayhi says, behaves analogously to the corresponding dependent constituent in the first case, and to the corresponding independent constituent in the second. A general statement follows: وكذلك جميع ما ذكرنا إذا أعملت فيه المصدر يجري[25] مجراه في الفعل "and such is the case with all we have mentioned, when you cause the verbal noun to operate on them [viz. annex a verbal noun to them], their behavior corresponds to their behavior following the [corresponding finite] verb".[26]

---

[18] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 14, Derenbourg 1, 14/Hārūn 1, 42.

[19] See also Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 15, Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 44; chapter 24, Derenbourg 1, 32/Hārūn 1, 83.

[20] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 14, Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 43.

[21] See also Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 452, Derenbourg 2, 258/Hārūn 4, 78.

[22] إذا جعلت الناس مفعولين—the 'personal' character of the term *maf'ūl* is noted in Mosel, "Terminologie," 246n2. See also Y. Peled, "Aspects of the Use of Grammatical Terminology in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition," in *Arabic Grammar and Linguistics*, ed. Y. Suleiman (Richmond: Curzon Press, 1999): 50–85.

[23] The first بعض functions as an apposition of the 'regular' *maf'ūl*, viz. الناس (دَفَعَ being a monotransitive verb), whereas the 'extra' *maf'ūl*, with بِ, owes its existence to a secondary process of 'causativization' by dint of this preposition.

[24] وإن جعلت الناس فاعلين—see fn. 22.

[25] Hārūn's edition reads: يجْرى.

[26] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 35, Derenbourg 1, 65/Hārūn 1, 154. See also Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 27, Derenbourg 1, 39/Hārūn 1, 96; chapter 35, Derenbourg 1, 65–66/Hārūn, 1, 154;

The term *mafʿūl* thus refers to the direct object of verbs in the active voice, the subject of passive verbs and the objective genitive, hence the inadequacy of its rendition as 'object'. What can be inferred from this discussion is that Sībawayhi regards these three syntactic functions as a 'correspondence set' constituting the syntactic aspect of the term *mafʿūl*. That is, the three constructions, ضَرَبَ عبدُ الله زيدًا "ʿAbdullāhi hit Zayd", ضُرِبَ زيدٌ "Zayd was hit" and ضَرْب زيدٍ "the hitting of Zayd" are regarded by Sībawayhi as syntactically analogous. Generally speaking, any of the three constructions implies the other two.[27] Moreover, as we shall see presently, the meaning conveyed by the *mafʿūl* in all three constructions is the same. This syntactic, as well as semantic, correspondence is the reason, so it seems, for labeling the three functions by the same term.[28]

As we shall see in the next section, there is semantic justification for such a set; however, Sībawayhi's conception of the term *mafʿūl* is not restricted to the semantic level and is not applied accidentally to constituents following a certain semantic condition.[29] In other words, the set of syntactic functions discussed above is part and parcel of Sībawayhi's conception of *mafʿūl*. The evidence supporting this interpretation will be discussed presently. But first, two remarks are in order:

First, it is rather tempting to interpret the term *mafʿūl* in terms of a unidirectional 'derivation', i.e. as applying to all direct objects, either in the surface structure or underlyingly (or 'originally').[30] Yet, although such a concept is coextensive with the syntactic aspect of Sībawayhi's concept of *mafʿūl*, it is nevertheless inadequate as its interpretation, simply because Sībawayhi does not couch this relationship in such terms. As we have seen, Sībawayhi juxtaposes, in one chapter, جَلَسَ "[he] sat" and ضُرِبَ "[he] was hit", even before he discusses ضَرَبَ "[he] hit", never stating that

---

chapter 40, Derenbourg 1, 80/Hārūn 1, 190; chapter 207, Derenbourg 1, 333/Hārūn 2, 359. See Mosel, "Terminologie," 249.

[27] This does not entail, however, that every transitive verb can be used in all three constructions (e.g. ليس "[he] is not"). It seems to be nonetheless a property of the prototypical transitive verbs.

[28] This correspondence is manifest also in Sībawayhi's discussion of verbs which basically take a prepositional phrase in addition to one (dependent) *mafʿūl*, yet the preposition may be omitted, which results in the *taʿaddin* "transitivity" of the verb to two *mafʿūl*s, e.g. سَمَّيْتُهُ بفلان "I named him such-and-such" vs. سَمَّيْتُهُ زيدًا "I named him Zayd"; into this discussion are incorporated also verbs in the passive voice. See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 11, Derenbourg 1, 12–13/Hārūn 1, 37–39.

[29] Cf. Mosel, "Terminologie," 247.

[30] Cf. Taha, "Syntax and Semantics," 55.

ضُرِبَ زيدٌ "Zayd was hit" is derived from, for example, ضَرَبَ عبدُ الله زيدًا "ʿAbdullāhi hit Zayd".[31] The following excerpt is of interest with this regard:

> ... نُبِّئْتُ زيدًا أبا فلانٍ لما كان الفاعل يتعدى إلى ثلاثة تعدى المفعول إلى اثنين[32] وتقول أُرَى عبدَ الله أبا فلان لأنك لو أدخلت في هذا الفعل الفاعل وبنيته له لتعداه فعله إلى ثلاثة مفعولين
>
> نُبِّئْتُ زيدًا أبا فلان ... "I was informed that Zayd is the father of so-and-so"—as the [verb of the] *fāʿil* passes over to three [*mafʿūl*s], the [verb of the] *mafʿūl* passes over to two, and you say: أُرَى عبدَ الله أبا فلان "I am made to think/know that ʿAbdallāhi is the father of so-and-so", since if you had added to this verb the *fāʿil* and formed it [viz. the verb] for it [the *fāʿil*; viz. used the active voice], its [the *fāʿil*'s] verb would have passed over beyond it to three *mafʿūl*s.[33]

Note that whereas in the first statement the direction is from the active to the passive (نَبَّأَ → نُبِّئَ), in the second it is from the passive to the active (أُرَى → يُرِي). This passage demonstrates the *correspondence* obtaining between *mafʿūl* as an object and as a subject in syntactical terms, even if we take into consideration the fact that *mafʿūl* as a subject is regarded as marked vis-à-vis *fāʿil* as a subject.[34]

Second, it is interesting to compare the syntactic aspect of the term *mafʿūl* to Sībawayhi's use of the term *ḫabar*. In addition to the predicate of the subject of nominal sentence (*mubtadaʾ*), this term applied also to the predicate in sentences introduced by إِنَّ "indeed" or one of its 'sisters',

---

31 See Saad, "Sībawayhi's Treatment of Transitivity," 83–85.

32 This is a rather peculiar wording, since it implies that it is the *fāʿil* and the *mafʿūl* which are 'passing over', whereas it is always the verb elsewhere in the *Kitāb*. One might suggest a different vocalization from the one presented here (taken from the printed editions of the *Kitāb*), namely: لماكان الفاعل يُتعدى إلى ثلاثة تُعُدِّيَ المفعولُ إلى اثنين "as the *fāʿil* is passed over [by the verb] to three [*mafʿūl*s], the *mafʿūl* is passed over [by the verb] to two", which solves this problem, although the text remains peculiar. On the other hand, a version presented in al-Sīrāfī's commentary suggests that the text is slightly corrupted: لما كان الفاعل يتعدى إلى ثلاثة تعدى فعل المفعول إلى اثنين "as the [verb of the] *fāʿil* passes over to three [*mafʿūl*s], the verb of the *mafʿūl* passes over to two". Abū saʿīd al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, ed. A.Ḥ. Mahdalī and ʿA.S. ʿAlī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 2008), 1, 291. I would like, on this occasion, to thank A. Sadan for bringing the Beirut edition of al-Sīrāfī's commentary to my attention during the conference.

33 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 15, Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 43.

34 For the sake of comparison, al-Sīrāfī, Sībawayhi's celebrated commentator, does couch the relationship between active and passive constructions in terms of 'derivation'. See, for example, al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, 1, 261. See also Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, 170ff.; Owens, *Foundations of Grammar*, 180ff.

the *mafʿūl* of كان "[he] was" (i.e. the predicate in sentences introduced by كان) and its 'sisters',[35] the second *mafʿūl* of ditransitive cognitive verbs such as حَسِبَ "[he] thought" and the circumstantial qualifier (*ḥāl*).[36] It thus applies to constituents whose relation with some other constituent corresponds to that obtaining between 'regular' predicates and subjects. This also seems like a set of functions engaging in a certain correspondence relations.[37]

Strong evidence for the centrality of the syntactic aspect in Sībawayhi's conception of *mafʿūl* stems from his theory that constituents conveying the meaning of a space/time qualifier (*ẓarf*) occasionally behave syntactically as *mafʿūl*s. These, consequently, may function as subjects of verbs in the passive voice and as objective genitives. Nevertheless, their meaning remains intact. Sībawayhi discusses this theory in scattered places in the *Kitāb*, including several instances in his series of 'transitivity' (*taʿaddin*) chapters, mentioned above; the following discussion will be based mainly on one chapter in which it is explicated in the most perspicuous and condensed manner, Chapter 38.[38] The title of this chapter reads: هذا باب جرى مجرى الفاعل الذي يتعدى[39] فعله إلى مفعولين في اللفظ لا في المعنى "this is a chapter [about what][40] behaves analogously to the active participle whose verb passes

---

[35] For Sībawayhi's application of the term *mafʿūl* to these constituents, see the discussion in the next section.

[36] See Mosel, "Terminologie," 281–85; Levin, "Sībawayhi's View of the Syntactical Structure of *kāna wa'axawātuhā*," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 1 (1979): 193ff.

[37] I will not discuss here the question of whether or not Sībawayhi regards this case of correspondence as a 'derivation', in light of his use of the verb تَدْخُلُ (see above); cf. Owens, *Foundations of Grammar*, 223–26, 242. Note that we have seen above that Sībawayhi uses the verb أدخلت with regard to the inference from the passive to the active construction!

[38] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 38, Derenbourg 1, 75–77/Hārūn 1, 175–81. See also Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 10, Derenbourg 1, 11–12/Hārūn 1, 35–37; chaprer 13, Derenbourg 1, 14/Hārūn 1, 41; chapter 14, Derenbourg 1, 14–15/Hārūn 1, 42; chapter 15, Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 43; chapter 25, Derenbourg 1, 33/Hārūn 1, 85; chapter 40, Derenbourg 1, 81/Hārūn 1, 193–94; chapter 42, Derenbourg 1, 88/Hārūn 1, 211; chapter 43, Derenbourg 1, 90–96/Hārūn 1, 216–28; chapter 45, Derenbourg 1, 99/Hārūn 1, 234–35. See G. Troupeau, "La notion de temps chez Sibawaihi," *Comptes rendus du Groupe linguistique d'études chamito-sémitiques* (*GLECS*) 9 (1960–63): 45; Levin, "*taʿaddā al-fiʿl ilā*," 195–96n11; J. Owens, *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory: Heterogeneity and Standardization* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990), 111–15; K. Versteegh, "Freedom of the Speaker? The Term *ittisāʿ* and Related Notions in Arabic Grammar," in *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*, ed. K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990), 281ff.; A. Kasher, "The *ẓarf* in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory" (Hebrew) (Ph.D. thesis, Bar-Ilan University, 2006), 207–39.

[39] Hārūn's edition reads: يتعداه.

[40] The notion of 'category' is conspicuous here in Sībawayhi's use of the word باب. On the other hand, in al-Sīrāfī's version, the word ما does follow the word باب; al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, 2, 31.

over to two *mafʿūl*s, in form, not in meaning".[41] The three relevant constructions are:

(1) يا سارقَ الليلةِ أهلَ الدار "Oh you who steals[42] from the people of the abode in the night!" (lit.: "Oh you who steals[43] the night from the people of the abode!"—see below),[44]
(2) سَرَقْتُ الليلةَ أهلَ الدار "I stole from the people of the abode in the night" (lit.: "I stole the night from the people of the abode"—see below),[45] and
(3) صِيدَ عليه يومان "hunting took place on it for two days" (lit: "two days were hunted on it"—see below).[46]

According to Sībawayhi, (1) is equivalent, with respect to its form (*lafẓ*), to (i.e. it displays the same syntactic behavior as):

(1)' هذا معطي زيدٍ درهمًا "this [man] gives[47] Zayd a Dirham",

whereas the meaning (*maʿnā*) of (1) is: في الليلة "in the night". Similarly, the meaning of (3) is صِيدَ عليه في اليومين "hunting took place on it for two days".[48]

That is to say, Sībawayhi distinguishes two states, the *ḥadd al-kalām* "the ordinary way of speech" and *saʿat al-kalām* "latitude of speech".[49] In the former state, the normal relationship is kept between the form (*lafẓ*) and the meaning (*maʿnā*) of configurations. The space/time qualifier (*ẓarf*) thus has a certain unmarked syntactic behavior, wherein it may function neither as the subject (taking the independent case) nor as a *nomen rectum* (taking the oblique case), and even when it takes the dependent case in a verbal sentence its case is not assigned to it by the verb by means of

---

[41] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 38, Derenbourg 1, 75/Hārūn 1, 175.
[42] Or: will steal, or: the one who stole.
[43] Or: will steal, or: the one who stole.
[44] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 38, Derenbourg 1, 75/Hārūn 1, 175.
[45] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 75/Hārūn 1, 176. As we shall see, another parsing is eligible here, to which the literal translation does not apply.
[46] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 38, Derenbourg 1, 75/Hārūn 1, 176.
[47] Or: will give, or: is the one who gave.
[48] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 38, Derenbourg 1, 75/Hārūn 1, 176.
[49] On this pair, see Levin, "*kāna wa'axawātuhā*," 211; Versteegh, "*ittisāʿ*," esp. 283; A. Levin, "The Theory of *al-taqdīr* and its Terminology," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 21 (1997): 155–57.

'transitivity' (*taʿaddin*).[50] On the other hand, in the latter state, the space/time qualifier behaves syntactically as a *mafʿūl*, while keeping its locative/temporal meaning intact. This accounts for examples (1) and (3): since a *mafʿūl*, but not a space/time qualifier, can implement the function of *nomen rectum* of an active participle, and since الليلة does not qualify as a 'regular' *mafʿūl* of the verb سَرَقَ,[51] الليلة only behaves formally as a *mafʿūl*, yet it keeps its temporal meaning, which is illustrated with the paraphrase في الليلة. A similar explanation holds for (3). The analysis of the dependent nominal in (2) as behaving syntactically as a *mafʿūl* can be accounted for if one considers the following schema:

هذا معطي زيدٍ درهمًا	يا سارقَ الليلةِ أهلَ الدار
(mine:) ضُرِبَ زيدٌ	صِيدَ عليه يومان
(mine:) أَعْطَيْتُ زيدًا درهمًا	سَرَقْتُ الليلةَ أهلَ الدار

In the left column there are three configurations displaying *mafʿūl*s implementing three syntactic functions: objective genitive, subject of a verb in the passive voice and dependent object, respectively. These constituents are *mafʿūl*s with regard to both form and meaning. In the right column are presented, in the first two rows, the two problematic constructions, in which a constituent carrying a meaning of a space/time qualifier behaves syntactically as a *mafʿūl*. From these it is inferred that a constituent conveying the meaning of a space/time qualifier may behave syntactically as a *mafʿūl*, and therefore nothing prevents it from this behavior also in the sentence appearing in the third row, although its unmarked parsing therein, needless to say, is as a regular space/time qualifier. Put differently, the third construction is sanctioned by the first two. The correspondence principle is manifest here: a construction in which الليلة functions as

---

[50] The dependent case of the space/time qualifier is explained by means of the principle of *tanwīn-naṣb*. See M.G. Carter, " 'Twenty Dirhams' in the *Kitāb* of Sībawaihi," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 35 (1972): 485–96; Owens, *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory*, 107ff.; A. Kasher, "Sībawayhi's *tanwīn-naṣb* principle revisited," *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 51 (2009): 42–50.

[51] Although this verb may take two direct objects (see E.W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* [London: Williams and Norgate, 1863–93], 4, 1352), الليلة qualifies as neither of them: those from which something is stolen are referred to by أهل الدار, and the night cannot be regarded as the thing stolen.

an objective genitive, one of the *mafʿūl*-functions, entails a construction in which it functions as a direct object.

The two-faceted character of *mafʿūl* is manifest in the pair of terms *lafẓ* "form" and *maʿnā* "meaning", used in the above discussion to designate syntactic behavior and meaning, respectively.

Furthermore, Sībawayhi's theory with regard to the space/time qualifier, as depicted here, applies *mutatis mutandis* also to the 'absolute object' (what came to be labeled by later grammarians *al-mafʿūl al-muṭlaq*).[52] I will not go here into Sībawayhi's conception of the 'absolute object';[53] suffice it to say that this time Sībawayhi labels these constituents explicitly as *mafʿūl*s (see also the next section).[54] The classification, on sheer syntactic grounds, as *mafʿūl*, of constituents which do not convey the semantic meaning of *mafʿūl*, is strong evidence against the interpretation of *mafʿūl* as merely a semantic term.

Corroboration for the centrality of the syntactic component of the concept of *mafʿūl* is provided by Sībawayhi's treatment of prepositional phrases. Chapter 26 of the *Kitāb* deals with constructions of the type: رَأَيْتُ زيدًا وعمرًا كَلَّمْتُهُ "I saw Zayd, and ʿAmr [dependent]—I spoke to him".[55] The second clause is an *ištiġāl* (lit. "being occupied") construction, the dependent case of عمرًا being explained by positing an underlying verb, كَلَّمْتُ, preceding it.[56] This holds also if the verb takes a prepositional phrase instead

[52] On the term *al-mafʿūl al-muṭlaq*, see Levin, "What is Meant by *al-mafʿūl al-muṭlaq*?" in *Semitic Studies: In Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of his Eighty-Fifth Birthday, November 14th, 1991*, ed. A.S. Kaye (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991), 2, 917–26.

[53] See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 10, Derenbourg 1, 11/Hārūn 1, 34–35; chapter 13, Derenbourg 1, 14/Hārūn 1, 41; chapter 14, Derenbourg 1, 14–15/Hārūn 1, 42; chapter 15, Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 43; chapter 42, Derenbourg 1, 88/Hārūn 1, 212; chapter 45, Derenbourg 1, 96–99/Hārūn 1, 228–34; chapter 75, Derenbourg 1, 149–51/Hārūn 1, 355–61; chapter 90, Derenbourg 1, 162/Hārūn 1, 385. See Versteegh, "*ittisāʿ*," 281ff.

[54] See, e.g., Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 45, Derenbourg 1, 96/Hārūn 1, 228. It is thus plausible that Sībawayhi also regards as *mafʿūl* those constituents conveying the meaning of space/time qualifier, yet syntactically behaving as *mafʿūl*, dealt with above.

[55] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 26, Derenbourg 1, 35/Hārūn 1, 88.

[56] The term *ištiġāl* is not used by Sībawayhi, who discusses such constructions in a series of chapters (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 24ff., Derenbourg 1, 31ff./Hārūn 1, 80ff.). See R. Baalbaki, "Some Aspects of Harmony and Hierarchy in Sībawayhi's Grammatical Analysis," *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 2 (1979): 7ff.; Owens, *Foundations of Grammar*, 188; Levin, "Theory of *al-taqdīr*," 144–45. The preference of this construction here stems from the tendency to maintain equilibrium between the two clauses: due to the *ištiġāl* construction, in both clauses the nouns are said to be 'built on' their verbs (here referring to their functioning as direct objects); on the other hand, عمرٌو كَلَّمْتُهُ "ʿAmr [independent]—I spoke to him", as the second clause, displays a construction in which the verb is 'built on' the noun (which is a subject of a nominal sentence [*mubtadaʾ*], the verbal clause being its predicate), thereby breaching the equilibrium, although the construction is permissible.

of a dependent noun: مَرَرْتُ بزيد وعمرًا مَرَرْتُ به "I passed by Zayd, and ʿAmr [dependent]—I passed by him";[57] Sībawayhi explains this by stating that زيدٍ is a *mafʿūl*,[58] as if it were said: مَرَرْتُ زيدًا*. This assertion is illustrated by adducing the sentence خَشَّنْتُ بصدره "I exasperated him", where صدر is in a 'place' (*mawḍiʿ*)[59] of the dependent and the meaning conveyed is that of the dependent.[60] A further analogy, both semantic and syntactic, is drawn between مَرَرْتُ به and لَقِيتُهُ "I met him".[61] Another construction, dealt with in the same chapter, which displays the parity between oblique and dependent nominals, is مَرَرْتُ بعمرو وزيدًا "I passed by ʿAmr and Zayd"; the oblique nominal in this construction is again regarded by Sībawayhi as in the 'place' (*mawḍiʿ*) of a dependent *mafʿūl*, and the meaning conveyed here is the same as that of أَتَيْتُ "I came to".[62] Sībawayhi thus couples his assertion that such oblique nominals convey the meaning of *mafʿūl* with the analogy he draws between them and dependent nominals functioning as *mafʿūl*, to wit, with a certain syntactic behavior.

2. The Semantic Component of the Term *Mafʿūl*

The point of departure of this section will be Mosel's rendition of the term *mafʿūl*. In light of the inadequacy of the rendition 'object' for the term

---

[57] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 27, Derenbourg 1, 37/Hārūn 1, 92.

[58] Elsewhere, however, Sībawayhi puts prepositional phrases in contradistinction to dependent nominals, so that only the latter are to be regarded as *mafʿūl*s: after mentioning the usage of the verb دعا as taking two *mafʿūl*s (in the sense of "[he] named"), he says: وإن عنيت الدعاء إلى أمر لم يجاوز مفعولا واحدا "but if you mean [by the verb دعا] calling [someone] to something, [this verb] does not exceed one *mafʿūl*" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 11, Derenbourg 1, 12/Hārūn 1, 37), that is, in the sentence (mine:) دَعَوْتُ زيدًا إلى أمرٍ "I called Zayd to something", only زيدًا is a *mafʿūl*, to the exclusion of أمرٍ. See also, in the next section, an instance where the difference between direct objects and prepositional phrases is regarded by Sībawayhi as semantically crucial.

[59] According to Versteegh, this term often means 'syntactic function'; C.H.M.Versteegh, "The Arabic Terminology of Syntactic Position," *Arabica* 25 (1978): 271ff. However, as he also shows, phrases such as في موضع الجر also occur, which he explains as "[it] occupies the place of the genitive" (ibid., 273).

[60] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 27, Derenbourg 1, 37/Hārūn 1, 92.

[61] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 37/Hārūn 1, 93.

[62] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 38/Hārūn 1, 94. This theory will be dealt with in a forthcoming article. Elsewhere, however, Sībawayhi refers to the entire prepositional phrases as in the 'place' (*mawḍiʿ*) of a dependent *mafʿūl*; Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 35, Derenbourg 1, 65/Hārūn 1, 153.

mafʿūl, Mosel suggests 'patient' instead,[63] quoting Vermeer's definition of the latter as the constituent whose "Inhalt als durch den Verbalinhalt betroffen oder bewirkt dargestellt wird",[64] although, she states, Sībawayhi uses *mafʿūl* as a grammatical term, as if there were a grammatical category of 'patient' in Arabic. Similarly, *fāʿil* is interpreted as 'agent'.

In the previous section we already pointed to the inadequacy of a purely semantic definition of the term *mafʿūl*, since the syntactic component is inherent in Sībawayhi's conception of this term.

An immediate difficulty in the equation *mafʿūl*-patient arises when transitive verbs such as رضي "[he] was pleased with" or خشي "[he] feared" are considered. Such verbs, which take non-patient *mafʿūl*s, show that direct objects of many verbs cannot be considered as conveying the meaning of patienthood as this notion is normally understood by linguists.[65] Consider, however, Chapter 432 of the *Kitāb*, entitled: هذا باب بناء الأفعال التي هي أعمال تعداك إلى غيرك وتوقعها به ومصادرها "this is the chapter about the patterns of the verbs which [denote] actions passing over beyond you [viz. the perpetrator] to someone/something else and you make [the action] befall him/it, and about their verbal nouns".[66] It is inferred from this chapter that action verbs can be either transitive (hence befalling someone/something) or intransitive. It is also inferred (see in what follows) that such actions are characterized as 'visible and audible'. Note that intransitive verbs need not necessarily denote action, but there is no reference in this chapter to non-action transitive verbs (but see below). This semantic trait of *ʿamal* "action" constitutes, for Sībawayhi, grounds on which he draws morphological analogies between the two groups (i.e. transitive and intransitive action verbs).

---

[63] Mosel, "Terminologie," 246ff. The correspondence between *mafʿūl* and 'patient' is, according to her, "ohne Einschränkung" (ibid., 246). See also Saad, "Sībawayhi's Treatment of Transitivity," 83–88; Taha, "*mafʿūl*," esp. 100.

[64] H.J. Vermeer, *Einführung in die linguistische Terminologie* (Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1971), 78. Whether or not this definition fits Vermeer's own ends has no bearing on the present discussion.

[65] The Western term 'patient' has been used in a large variety of senses by different linguists. We are nevertheless exempt from surveying all the meanings, since Mosel explicates what she means by 'patient'. Note that the translation of *fāʿil* as 'agent' faces a similar difficulty; see H. Hamzé, "La position du sujet du verbe dans la pensée des grammairiens arabes," in *Langage et linéarité*, ed. P. Cotte (Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1999), 127–28; Y. Peled, "*ḍamīr*," in *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, ed. K. Versteegh et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 1, 556.

[66] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 432, Derenbourg 2, 224/Hārūn 4, 5. Cf. Levin, "*taʿaddā al-fiʿl ilā*," 205–6.

Although this category of verbs is characterized as denoting actions befalling the referents of their direct objects, verbs such as رضي are also subsumed under this category. Two explanations for this apparent discrepancy can be suggested, which are by no means mutually incompatible:

First, Sībawayhi's conception of the notion of 'being affected' with regard to the semantics of verbs (i.e. the notion of patienthood) may differ from the one generally used in modern linguistics, by being more relaxed. Interesting in this respect is the following quotation from Lyons, regarding the relationship between the 'formal' and the 'traditional-notional' aspects of transitivity; after pointing to the 'inappropriateness' of what he labels "the traditional 'notional' definition of transitivity", according to which "the effects of the action expressed by the verb 'pass over' from the 'agent' (or 'actor') to the 'patient' (or 'goal')", he says:

> Furthermore, it might be maintained that the grammatical form of an English sentence like *I hear you* or *I see you* (its parallelism with *I hit you*, etc.) influences speakers of English to think of hearing and seeing as activities initiated by the person 'doing' the hearing and seeing. Whether this is a correct account of perception, from a psychological or physiological point of view, is irrelevant. If the native speaker of English ... tends to interpret perception as an activity which 'proceeds' from an 'actor' to a 'goal', this fact of itself would suggest that there is some semantic basis for the traditional notion of transitivity. [67]

That is, the verb رضي, for instance, due to its formal characteristics, might have been construed by Sībawayhi as denoting a رضوان (its verbal noun) befalling the referent of the direct object.

Second, Sībawayhi seems to regard the notion of transference of an action as basic, or prototypical,[68] to the formal feature of transitivity, so that verbs which, at least *prima facie*, do not conform to this notion yet display the formal characteristics of transitive verbs, are said to be 'inserted' (i.e. 'incorporated' or 'drawn') into this category. Taylor lists

---

[67] J. Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 350–51. Cf. G.N. Saad, *Transitivity, Causation and Passivization: A Semantic-Syntactic Study of the Verb in Classical Arabic* (London: Kegan Paul International, 1982), 87–88.

[68] The phenomenon of prototypicality is ubiquitous in grammatical terminology. For this phenomenon (labeled 'hard core') with regard to the parts of speech, see G. Bohas, J.-P. Guillaume, and D.E. Kouloughli, *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition* (London: Routledge, 1990), 51–53.

several semantic properties characterizing prototypical transitivity, of which those relevant to the present discussion are:

> ... The event is initiated by the referent of the subject NP, i.e. by the agent.... As a consequence of the agent's action, something happens to the patient,[69] i.e. the referent of the object nominal.... After the occurrence of the event, the patient is in a different state from before the event. Usually, the difference is one which would be highly perceptible to an onlooking observer; ... The agent's action on the patient usually involves direct physical contact, ... The event has a causative component, i.e. the agent's action causes the patient to undergo a change; ...[70]

Taylor then discusses deviations from this paradigm case, including verbs denoting perception (e.g. 'watch' and 'see'), mental states (e.g. 'like'), relations between entities (e.g. 'resemble'), as well as verbs stating a property of the subject's referent (e.g. 'cost').[71]

Interesting in this regard is Sībawayhi's treatment of the verb سَخِطَ "[he] was angry". He explains the pattern of the verbal noun (*maṣdar*) of this verb, viz. *faʿal*, which is characteristic of intransitive verbs,[72] by analogy to the (near-)synonym غَضِبَ, on the ground of their identical verbal pattern (*faʿila*) and their semantic similarity.[73] The following statement ensues يدلك ساخط وسَخِطْتُهُ أنه مدخل في باب الأعمال التي ترى وتسمع وهو موقعه بغيره "[the forms] ساخط "angry" and سخطته "I was angry with him" show you that [this verb] is 'inserted' into the category of [verbs denoting] actions which are visible and audible, and that [possibly: while] he [viz. the perpetrator] causes it to befall someone/something else."[74] What is asserted here is that contrary to its (near-)synonym غضب, the verb سخط takes a direct object and its verbal adjective takes the pattern *fāʿil*,[75] both regarded as formal characteristics of transitive action verbs, which raises the abovementioned problem with regard to the pattern the verbal noun this verb takes. This verb is

---

69 Taylor's use of the term 'patient' here is rather relaxed, yet still semantically restricted: whereas he comments on "John obeyed Mary" that "it is doubtful whether it is still legitimate to speak of the subject [in this sentence] as the agent and of the direct object as the patient", he does not prompt this doubt with regard to the sentences "We approached the city" and "I read the book". See J.R. Taylor, *Linguistic Categorization*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 233–34.

70 Ibid., 232–33.

71 Ibid., 233–34.

72 See W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896–98), 1, 113.

73 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 432, Derenbourg 2, 225/Hārūn 4, 6.

74 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 432, Derenbourg 2, 225/Hārūn 4, 6.

75 Note that the verbal adjective of غضب does not take the form *fāʿil*. See al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, 4, 400, also quoted in Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 432, Hārūn 4, 6n3.

thus 'inserted' into a category characterized notionally.[76] It is not clear, though, whether projection of the notional property of this category on to this verb ensues, that is, whether Sībawayahi holds that speakers conceive of this verb as denoting an action befalling someone/something, by virtue of its formal behavior, or that to the contrary, this verb is only said to behave formally as if it had these notional traits. A somewhat clearer statement appears in the next chapter; there Sībawayhi discusses *inter alia* intransitive verbs denoting fear, whose verbal adjectives take the pattern *faʿil* and whose verbal nouns take the pattern *faʿal* (see above), e.g. فَرِقَ and فَزِعَ. Their transitive use, i.e. فَرِقْتُهُ and فَزِعْتُهُ "I feared him", is then explained; the problem this usage raises seems to be both semantic and formal: the sense of fear is apparently semantically construed as fitting intransitive non-action verbs, which is consonant with the fact that other verbs of fear are intransitive, e.g. وَجِلَ, and with the fact that the verbal adjective of these verbs take the pattern *faʿil*, rather than *fāʿil*, and their verbal nouns take the pattern *faʿal*. These ostensibly transitive verbs are explained as being in the sense of فَرِقْتُ منه, wherefrom the preposition is elided; these verbs are thus not considered as basically transitive.[77] Then the verb خَشِيتُهُ "I feared him" is considered, which is transitive and whose verbal adjective takes the pattern *fāʿil*—two formal features which, as we have seen, designates that the verb in question belongs to the category of transitive action verbs. Moreover, its verbal noun takes the form *faʿla* rather then *faʿal*. This is accounted for by analogy to the verb رَحِمَ "[he] had mercy on", which belongs to the category of transitive action verbs;[78] here Sībawayhi states that the formal behavior of this verb differs from that of other verbs conveying the same meaning, i.e. verbs denoting fear, and that the patterns of its verbal adjective and of its verbal noun are accorded to a verb which has the same verbal pattern, viz. *faʿila*.[79] Thus, although the verb خشي behaves just like other verbs considered as denoting an action befalling someone/something, its meaning is still regarded as identical to intransitive verbs denoting fear. Hence, its direct object is not a patient.[80]

---

[76] See also Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 432, Derenbourg 2, 226/Hārūn 4, 9.

[77] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 433, Derenbourg 2, 230/Hārūn 4, 18–19.

[78] On this verb, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 432, Derenbourg 2, 226/Hārūn 4, 9.

[79] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 433, Derenbourg 2, 230/Hārūn 4, 19.

[80] There is no indication in the text of the *Kitāb* bearing out al-Sīrāfī's interpretation, to the effect that خشيه also originates in خشي منه, as well as that سخطه originates in سخط منه; al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, 4, 408–9. See also Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 442, Derenbourg 2, 245/Hārūn 4, 49, where خشي, as well as خاف and هاب are regarded as transitive, without

The corollary from this discussion is that there exists a group of transitive verbs which are semantically construed as denoting actions befalling someone/something; there are also verbs which are said to behave formally as transitive action verbs, although they are probably not semantically construed as such. It is not clear, with regard to a host of transitive verbs, to which of the two categories they belong.[81]

More conclusive counterevidence against the equation *mafʿūl*-patient can be extracted from Sībawayhi's treatment of كان "[he] was" and its 'sisters'.[82] According to Chapter 17, also in the abovementioned series of 'transitivity' (*taʿaddin*) chapters, the independent nominal in sentences introduced by كان and its 'sisters' is labeled *fāʿil* (also: *ism al-fāʿil*), and the dependent nominal—*mafʿūl* (also: *ism al-mafʿūl*). كان and its 'sisters' are subsumed along with ضَرَبَ "[he] hit" under the same general category, with regard to their *taʿaddin* to one *mafʿūl*, and the basic reason for Sībawayhi to present them in separate chapters is, as he says, the fact that the two constituents in sentences introduced by كان are لشيء واحد, i.e. they refer to the same thing, a semantic fact which entails the impermissibility of the omission of the *mafʿūl*. Sībawayhi introduces in this chapter several syntactic similarities between كان and ضَرَبَ.[83] What is striking with regard to كان and its 'sisters' is that Sībawayhi himself states that these verbs—as well as ditransitive cognitive verbs such as حَسِبَ "[he] thought"—do not indicate an action affecting the referent(s) of the *mafʿūl*(s). He says, regarding these two categories: ...وليس[84] بفعل أحدثته منك إلى غيرك كضَرَبْتُ وأَعْطَيْتُ ". . . . and they are not [verbs denoting] actions which you perpetrate from you to someone/something else, such as ضَرَبْتُ "I hit" and أَعْطَيْتُ "I gave"."[85] The *mafʿūl*s in these cases are therefore regarded by

any qualification. If al-Sīrāfī's interpretation were correct, this would mean that the verb خشي is basically intransitive, hence irrelevant to our discussion, just like فرق and فزع.

[81] Interestingly enough, the verb رضي is deemed in medieval Arabic lexicons an antonym of the verb سخط; see Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, 3, 1099–1100. Needless to say, the discussion above does not aim at being a comprehensive account of the issue of semantics of verbs in the *Kitāb*, which merits a separate study.

[82] For an extensive study of the issues discussed here, see Levin, "*kāna wa'axawātuhā*," 185–213.

[83] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 17, Derenbourg 1, 16/Hārūn 1, 45–46. See also Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 26, Derenbourg 1, 35/Hārūn 1, 89; chapter 29, Derenbourg 1, 42/Hārūn 1, 102.

[84] al-Sīrāfī's version reads: وليسا, which seems more plausible; al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, 3, 126.

[85] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 211, Derenbourg 1, 337/Hārūn 2, 366. Sībawayhi's application of the term *taʿaddin* "transitivity" to كان and its 'sisters' and to cognitive verbs such as حسب is regarded by Levin as strong evidence against the interpretation of the term *taʿaddin* as denoting the 'passing' of an action; Levin, "*taʿaddā al-fiʿl ilā*," 198–99.

Sībawayhi himself as not affected, and consequently the term 'patient', as defined above, does not apply to them.[86]

What I would like to suggest, with regard to the semantic component of the term *mafʿūl*, is: (a) that the meaning of a certain *mafʿūl* is the same, regardless of which of the three abovementioned syntactic functions it assumes; (b) that the meaning of *mafʿūl* is relative to each verb; (c) that it is relative to each 'slot';[87] (d) that it basically corresponds to the meaning conveyed by the passive participle of the verb at stake: Zayd being مضروب is asserted in the sentence ضَرَبَ عبدُ اللّٰه زيدًا "ʿAbdullāhi hit Zayd", as well as in ضُرِبَ زيدٌ "Zayd was hit" and ضَرْب زيدٍ "the hitting of Zayd". Correspondingly, the referent of the *fāʿil* in the first sentence, viz. ʿAbdullāhi, is the ضارب. The difficulty for the *mafʿūl*-patient equation, with regard to non-patient *mafʿūl*s such as the *mafʿūl* of رضي and خشي, does not arise here: in the sentences (mine:) رَضِيتُ زيدًا "I was pleased with Zayd" and خَشِيتُ زيدًا "I feared Zayd", the referent of زيد, viz. Zayd, is said to be the مرضيّ (or: مرضوّ) and the مخشيّ, respectively.[88]

In what follows we shall survey the *loci* in the *Kitāb* where the meaning of *mafʿūl* is referred to.

---

86 Note also that كان does not appear in the chapters regarding the patterns of transitive and intransitive verbs (see above), possibly due to the prominence of the semantic characteristic of transitivity therein. This notwithstanding the fact that with regard to its formal behavior, كان fits perfectly in the category of transitive action verbs, since its verbal adjective takes the form *fāʿil* and its verbal noun takes the form *faʿl*!

87 By 'slot' I refer here to the distinction customarily drawn between 'first', 'second' and 'third' *mafʿūl* (*mafʿūl awwal*, *ṯānin* and *ṯāliṯ*, respectively).

88 The argument put forward here does not rule out the possibility that patienthood may be regarded as the prototypical meaning of the direct object. In fact, this would be in line with our argument, since the prototypical meaning of the passive participle seems to be also of patienthood: after Sībawayhi states that *faʿīl* in the sense of *mafʿūl* (في معنى مفعول) has the 'broken' plural pattern *faʿlā* (e.g. قتيل "killed person" and its plural form قتلى; it is inferred that قتيل is regarded as semantically identical to the passive participle مقتول) (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 431, Derenbourg 2, 222/Hārūn 3, 647), he explains, on the authority of his master, al-Ḫalīl, the 'broken' plural pattern *faʿlā* of forms such as مرضى (the plural form of مريض "sick person"; it is inferred that مريض is not identical, for him, to the passive participle ممروض), as follows: لأن ذلك أمر يبتلون به وأدخلوا فيه وهم له كارهون وأصيبوا به فلما كان المعنى معنى المفعول كسروه على هذا المعنى "due to the fact that it is something by which they are afflicted, into which they are brought against their will and by which they were smitten. As the meaning is the meaning of the passive participle, they used for it the 'broken' plural according to this meaning." Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 431, Derenbourg 2, 223/Hārūn 3, 648. The term *mafʿūl*, needless to say, pertains in this excerpt to the morphological level. See also Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 431, Derenbourg 2, 223–24/Hārūn 3, 649–50.

The correspondence, discussed in Section 1, between *mafʿūl* as a direct object and *mafʿūl* as a subject, is justified by Sībawayhi on semantic grounds as well:

واعلم أن المفعول الذي لم يتعد إليه فعل فاعل في التعدي والاقتصار بمنزلته إذا تعدى إليه فعل الفاعل لأن معناه متعديا إليه فعل الفاعل وغير متعد إليه فعله سواء.

> know that the *mafʿūl* to which a verb of a *fāʿil* does not pass over [i.e. which functions as a subject], has—with regard to passing over and failing to pass over—the same status as the [corresponding *mafʿūl*] when the *fāʿil*'s verb does pass over to it [i.e. when it functions as a direct object], since its meaning is the same whether or not the verb of the *fāʿil* passes over to it.[89]

This is illustrated by the fact that it is impermissible to add another *mafʿūl* to ضَرَبْتُ زيداً "I hit Zayd" or ضُرِبَ زيدٌ "Zayd was hit", in both of which زيد is a *mafʿūl*.[90] The same is asserted with regard to كَسَوْتُ زيداً ثوباً "I clothed Zayd in a garment" vs. كُسِيَ زيدٌ ثوباً "Zayd was clothed in a garment": زيدٌ in the latter is said to have the same status as زيداً in the former.[91] In both cases the explanation is that the same meaning (*maʿnā*) is conveyed. This chapter demonstrates thus that the meaning of a certain *mafʿūl* as an object and as a subject is the same; it is also inferred that this meaning is sensitive to the 'slot' the *mafʿūl* occupies: with regard to a ditransitive verb such as كسا, Sībawayhi states that its first *mafʿūl* keeps its meaning regardless of whether it is a subject or an object; it is thus inferred that this meaning differs from the meaning of the second object of this verb.

The identity of *mafʿūl* as an object and as a subject, with respect to meaning, is manifest also in Chapter 16 dealing with the circumstantial qualifier (*ḥāl*): while characterizing the distinction between the circumstantial qualifier and the *mafʿūl* on semantic grounds,[92] Sībawayhi puts, with respect to meaning (*maʿnā*), the *mafʿūl* functioning as the second object of the verb كسا (regardless of whether or not the first object is mentioned) on a par with the *mafʿūl* functioning as the subject of a passive verb. That is, the meaning (*maʿnā*) of الثوب, which is *mafʿūl*, is the same

---

89 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 14, Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 42.

90 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 14, Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 42.

91 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 43.

92 The circumstantial qualifier (*ḥāl*) is characterized as حال وقع فيه الفعل "[denoting] a circumstance under which [the content of] the verb occurred", which is not the case with *mafʿūl*; Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 16, Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 44. On this usage of *ḥāl* and *fiʿl* as metagrammatical intuitive terms, whose semantic scopes cover both their meaning as technical terms, and the everyday concepts underlying them, see Peled, "Grammatical Terminology," 50–85.

in كَسَوْتُ زيدًا الثوبَ "I clothed Zayd in the garment", كَسَوْتُ الثوبَ "I clothed [someone] in the garment" and كُسِيَ الثوبُ "the garment was clothed [on someone]".[93] Again, from Sībawayhi's assertion that the meaning of the second *mafʿūl* of a ditransitive verb is the same regardless of whether it functions as an object or as a subject, a distinction is inferred between the meaning of the first and the second *mafʿūl*s of such verbs. Both *mafʿūl*s (i.e. الثوب and زيد) are nevertheless coupled together semantically, in this chapter, in contradistinction to the circumstantial qualifier.

After dealing, in Chapter 12, with ditransitive cognitive verbs such as حسب, e.g., حَسِبَ عبدُ الله زيدًا بكرًا "ʿAbdullāhi thought that Zayd is Bakr",[94] Sībawayhi discusses in Chapter 13 the corresponding tritransitive verbs, such as أَرَى, e.g. أَرَى اللهُ زيدًا بشرًا أباك "God caused Zayd to think/know that Bišr is your father".[95] The first *mafʿūl* in these constructions (here: زيدًا) is said to be semantically identical to the *fāʿil* in the constructions of the previous chapter (here: عبدُ الله): ... لأن المفعول هاهنا كالفاعل في الباب الأول الذي قبله في المعنى "... since the *mafʿūl* here is like the *fāʿil* in the preceding chapter, with respect to meaning".[96] In a similar vein, Sībawayhi points to the parity between خَوَّفْتُ الناسَ ضعيفَهم قويَّهم "I caused the weak people to fear the strong" and خاف الناسُ ضعيفُهم قويَّهم "The weak people feared the strong", although الناس is *mafʿūl* in the former, but *fāʿil* in the latter.[97] These passages demonstrate again the sensitivity of the meaning of *mafʿūl* to its 'slot'. They also demonstrate its relativity to each verb: although the meaning of the *fāʿil* of خاف is the same as the meaning of the first *mafʿūl* of خوّف, the first is a *fāʿil* and the second is a *mafʿūl* since these labels are relative to each verb. The subject of the verb خاف is its *fāʿil*, and its referent is the خائف (its active participle), whereas the first direct object of خوّف is its *mafʿūl*, and its referent is the مُخَوَّف (its passive participle).[98]

We have already seen, in Section 1, that Sībawayhi refers, in his discussion of constituents conveying the meaning of space/time qualifier

---

[93] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 16, Derenbourg 1, 15/Hārūn 1, 44.

[94] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 12, Derenbourg 1, 13–14/Hārūn 1, 39–41.

[95] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 13, Derenbourg 1, 14/Hārūn 1, 41.

[96] Ibid.

[97] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 35, Derenbourg 1, 65/Hārūn 1, 153.

[98] For more such cases (including a pair of sentences whose verbs do not share the same root), see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 35, Derenbourg 1, 65/Hārūn 1, 153–54; chapter 35, Derenbourg 1, 67/Hārūn 1, 156–58. These cases raise the question of the extent to which the meanings of *mafʿūl*s of ditransitive and tritransitive verbs are conveyed by the passive participles of these verbs. The text of the *Kitāb*, however, does not provide an answer to this question.

(*ẓarf*) yet behaving as *mafʿūl*, to the meaning (*maʿnā*) of *mafʿūl*. Note, in this respect, Sībawayhi's statement regarding verbal nouns functioning as subjects of passive verbs, i.e. analyzed as *mafʿūl*s, as a case of *saʿat al-kalām* "latitude of speech", e.g., ضُرِبَ به ضربتان "striking took place with it [viz. a whip], of two strokes", lit.: "two strokes were struck with it": وإن كانت الضربتان لا تُضربان "although the two strokes are not [the person/thing which is actually] being struck".[99] What is asserted here is that when a certain constituent is a *mafʿūl*, it is expected to convey the meaning of the subject of the verb in question in the passive voice (that is, the verb in the passive voice can be predicated of it). This condition is not met with the verbal noun analyzed as a *mafʿūl*, hence the discrepancy between syntax and semantics, designated by the term *saʿat al-kalām* here. Put differently, the constituent in question does not refer to what is actually مضروب.

Although Sībawayhi does not correlate his parsing of the predicate in sentences introduced by كان as a *mafʿūl* directly with its meaning, there is an indication in the text of the *Kitāb* that point (d) applies to كان. Sībawayhi says in the chapter about كان and its 'sisters': فهو كائن ومَكُون كما[100] كان ضارب ومضروب, [101] that is, كائن and مكون, as active and passive participles, respectively, belong to the verb كان just as the forms ضارب and مضروب belong to the verb ضَرَبَ.[102] That is, in كان عبدُ الله أخاك "'Abdullāhi was your brother", عبد الله is the كائن, whereas أخاك is the مَكُون. This might explain the labels *fāʿil* and *mafʿūl*, respectively.[103]

3. A Possible Provenance of the Term *Mafʿūl*

It has been suggested in modern scholarship that the term *mafʿūl* originated in the term *mafʿūl bihi* (lit. "that to which [the content of the verb] is done"),[104] an impersonal passive participle, by the omission of the prep-

99 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 45, Derenbourg 1, 97/Hārūn 1, 229–30.

100 Hārūn's edition reads: تقول.

101 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 17, Derenbourg 1, 16/Hārūn 1, 46.

102 See Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, 221.

103 As noted above, the direct linkage between the meaning conveyed by a *mafʿūl* and the passive participle of its verb does not apply to all verbs. An obvious counterexample is ليس "[he] is not", which has no passive participle. Another case is prepositional phrases such as مَرَرْتُ بزيد (see Section 1). See also the remark in fn. 98 regarding ditransitive and tritransitive verbs. It is still the case that in all these categories the meaning conveyed by *mafʿūl* is relative to each verb (rather than a general meaning of patient).

104 This literal sense may be linked to the 'patient' interpretation of this term.

ositional phrase.[105] Even if such a process is plausible,[106] the assumption that the introduction of the term *mafʿūl* followed, chronologically, the use of the term *mafʿūl bihi*, is not substantiated by the *Kitāb*: whereas the term *mafʿūl* occurs in Derenbourg's edition of the *Kitāb*, according to Troupeau, 174 times, both as a semantico-syntactic and a morphological term, the term *mafʿūl bihi* occurs only six times.[107] Out of these, two are totally irrelevant, since *mafʿūl bihi* conveys therein a meaning akin to the term *mafʿūl maʿahu* "accompanying object", lit. "that with which [the content of the verb] is done".[108] As for the remaining four, none of them appears as such, if at all, in all the versions of the *Kitāb* at hand in the printed editions.[109] Thus, the extent to which Sībawayhi in fact uses the

---

[105] See R. Köbert, "Zum Verständnis des arabischen Grammatikerterminus *mafʿūl* und seiner Verbindungen," *Orientalia* 29 (1960): 330; Levin, "*al-mafʿūl al-muṭlaq*," 924. al-Sīrāfī, on the other hand, suggests a different explanation: given that the 'real' *mafʿūl* (المفعول الصحيح) is what is originated by the *fāʿil*, e.g. created things by God, actions by human beings, the application of the term *mafʿūl* by the grammarians to the direct object is merely figurative (*majāz*; see Versteegh, "*ittisāʿ*," 285–86); al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, 3, 129.

[106] Köbert draws a parallel between the pair *mafʿūl bihi* and *mafʿūl*, on the one hand, and the pair *al-mubtadaʾ bihi* and *al-mubtadaʾ* (the subject of a nominal sentence), on the other; for him, *al-mubtadaʾ* is the shortened form of *al-mubtadaʾ bihi*. See Köbert, "*mafʿūl*," 330. However, since Sībawayhi uses the verb ابتدا as a directly transitive verb far more frequently than with the preposition بِ, Köbert's view is unfounded. I have also not found any occurrence of *al-mubtadaʾ bihi* in the *Kitāb*; see also G. Troupeau, *Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1976), 36–37. A similar case is that of the term *maʿmūl fīhi* (the constituent affected by the grammatical operation): whereas it appears three times, in Derenbourg's and Hārūn's editions, as *maʿmūl fīhi* (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 41, Derenbourg 1, 84, line 13/Hārūn 1, 202; chapter 41, Derenbourg 1, 84, line 17/Hārūn 1, 202–3; chapter 176, Derenbourg 1, 303/Hārūn 2, 281), it appears in these editions twice as *maʿmūl* alone (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 32, Derenbourg 1, 53/Hārūn 1, 128; chapter 41, Derenbourg 1, 84, line 16/Hārūn 1, 202); however, these two occurrences also appear as *maʿmūl fīhi* in some of the manuscripts consulted in Derenbourg's edition. A more convincing case is the expression موقوع "that to which [the content of the verb] is done" in Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 187, Derenbourg 1, 316/Hārūn 2, 313; the same notion, however, is conveyed later by the word موضع "place" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 187, Derenbourg 1, 316/Hārūn 2, 314), raising the possibility of corruption in the text. Another such case is the passive participle متعدى, referring to direct objects (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 13, Derenbourg 1, 14/Hārūn 1, 41), since the direct object of the verb تعدى (see above) is the subject, not the direct object.

[107] Troupeau, *Lexique-Index*, 164.

[108] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 58, Derenbourg 1, 125, line 11/Hārūn 1, 297; chapter 58, Derenbourg 1, 125, line 15/Hārūn 1, 298. See Mosel, "Terminologie," 256.

[109] The one in Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 10, Derenbourg 1, 11 appears as *mafʿūl* in Hārūn 1, 34; the one in Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 19, Derenbourg 1, 22/Hārūn 1, 57 is a part of a sentence which does not appear at all in one of Derenbourg's manuscripts; the one in Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 66, Derenbourg 1, 136 does not appear in one of Derenbourg's manuscripts as well as in Hārūn 1, 325 and seems to be a late interpolation (see Jahn, *Sîbawaihi's Buch* 1.2, 204); and the one in Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 89, Derenbourg 1, 161/Hārūn 1, 383 appears as *mafʿūl* in several of Derenbourg's manuscripts.

term *mafʿūl bihi* is unclear; at best, it is extremely marginal vis-à-vis the term *mafʿūl*. We should therefore at least not rule out the possibility that the term *mafʿūl*, in the semantico-syntactic sense, is an original term, and try to account for it. This can be explained by the linkage pointed to above between the semantic component of *mafʿūl* and the passive participle. It might be the case that زيدًا in ضَرَبَ عبدُ اللهِ زيدًا "ʿAbdullāhi hit Zayd" was termed *mafʿūl* since it conveys the meaning of مضروب, which is the morphological *mafʿūl*, the passive participle.[110]

Studies have shown that one of the facets of Sībawayhi's terminology is that terms are often applied to more than one level of linguistic analysis.[111] In the case of *mafʿūl*, the direction of the semantic extension might be discerned, i.e. from the morphological level to syntax. Further study should decide whether or not this is the general direction with regard to early Arabic grammatical terminology.

Conclusion

The term *mafʿūl* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* pertains exclusively neither to the syntactic nor to the semantic level of linguistic analysis. It carries both syntactic and semantic aspects. At the syntactic level it is not restricted to one syntactic function, but rather consists of a 'correspondence set' of syntactic functions. At the semantic level it does not correspond to the term 'patient', but conveys a meaning relative to each verb, basically corresponding to the meaning of the passive participle. This raises the possibility that the origin of this term is to be found in its morphological meaning.

110 The direction of our argumentation here can, of course, be inverted: if it is the case that the semantico-syntactic term *mafʿūl* in fact originated in the morphological meaning of this term, this substantially corroborates our argument for the link between the semantic component of *mafʿūl* and the passive participle.

One might venture to raise the possibility that it was the semantico-syntactic use of the term *fāʿil* which prompted the semantico-syntactic use of *mafʿūl*, its already established counterpart at the morphological level.

111 See e.g. M.G. Carter, *Sībawayhi* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 53–54. Note that Troupeau does not differentiate between the semantico-syntactic and morphological *mafʿūl*s. Rather, he translates *mafʿūl* as 'opéré'. See Troupeau, *Lexique-Index*, 164.

References

Primary Sources

Abū saʿīd al-Sīrāfī al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Marzubān. *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*. Edited by Aḥmad Ḥasan Mahdalī and ʿAlī Sayyid ʿAlī. 5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 2008.
Sībawayhi, ʿAmr ibn ʿUṯmān. *Kitāb*, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Edited by H. Derenbourg. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1970), (2) edited by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. 5 vols. [Beirut]: ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1983.

Secondary Sources

Baalbaki, R. "Some Aspects of Harmony and Hierarchy in Sībawayhi's Grammatical Analysis." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 2 (1979): 7–22.
Bobzin, H. "Zum Begriff der 'Valenz' des Verbums in der arabischen Nationalgrammatik." In *The History of Linguistics in the Near East*, edited by C.H.M. Versteegh, K. Koerner, and H.-J. Niederehe, 93–108. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1983.
Bohas, G., J.-P. Guillaume, and D.E. Kouloughli. *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*. London: Routledge, 1990.
Carter, M.G. "'Twenty Dirhams' in the *Kitāb* of Sībawaihi." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 35 (1972): 485–96.
——, ed. *Arab Linguistics: An Introductory Classical Text with Translation and Notes*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1981.
——, *Sībawayhi*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2004.
Hamzé, H. "La position du sujet du verbe dans la pensée des grammairiens arabes." In *Langage et linéarité*, edited by P. Cotte, 127–49. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1999.
Jahn, G., trans. *Sîbawaihi's Buch über die Grammatik übersetzt und erklärt*. 2 vols. Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1895–1900.
Kasher, A. "The *ẓarf* in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory" (Hebrew). Ph.D. thesis, Bar-Ilan University, 2006.
——, "Sībawayhi's *tanwīn-naṣb* principle revisited." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 51 (2009): 42–50.
Köbert, R. "Zum Verständnis des arabischen Grammatikerterminus *mafʿūl* und seiner Verbindungen." *Orientalia* 29 (1960): 328–30.
Lane, E.W. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1863–93.
Levin, A. "The Meaning of *taʿaddā al-fiʿl ilā* in Sībawayhi's *al-Kitāb*." In *Studia Orientalia Memoriae D.H. Baneth Dedicata*, 193–210. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979.
——, "Sībawayhi's View of the Syntactical Structure of *kāna waʾaxawātuhā*." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 1 (1979): 185–213.
——, "What is Meant by *al-mafʿūl al-muṭlaq*?" In *Semitic Studies: In Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of his Eighty-Fifth Birthday, November 14th, 1991*, edited by A.S. Kaye, 2, 917–26. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991.
——, "The Theory of *al-taqdīr* and its Terminology." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 21 (1997): 142–66.
Lyons, J. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
Mosel, U. "Die syntaktische Terminologie bei Sibawaih." Ph.D. thesis, University of Munich, 1975.
Owens, J. *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988.
——, *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory: Heterogeneity and Standardization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990.

Peled, Y. "Aspects of the Use of Grammatical Terminology in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition." In *Arabic Grammar and Linguistics*, edited by Y. Suleiman, 50–85. Richmond: Curzon Press, 1999.
——, "*ḍamīr*." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, edited by K. Versteegh et al., 1, 555–59. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
Saad, G.N. "Sībawayhi's Treatment of Transitivity." *al-ʿArabiyya* 12 (1979): 83–88.
——, *Transitivity, Causation and Passivization: A Semantic-Syntactic Study of the Verb in Classical Arabic*. London: Kegan Paul International, 1982.
Suleiman, Y. *The Arabic Grammatical Tradition: A Study in taʿlīl*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.
Taha, Z.A. "Issues of Syntax and Semantics: A Comparative Study of Sibawayhi, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarraaj." Ph.D. thesis, Georgetown University, 1995.
——, "*mafʿūl*." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, edited by K. Versteegh et al., 3, 100–106. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
Taylor, J.R. *Linguistic Categorization*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
Troupeau, G. "La notion de temps chez Sibawaihi." *Comptes rendus du Groupe linguistique d'études chamito-sémitiques* (*GLECS*) 9 (1960–63): 44–46.
——, *Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1976.
Vermeer, H.J. *Einführung in die linguistische Terminologie*. Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1971.
Versteegh, C.H.M. [=Kees]. *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
——, "The Arabic Terminology of Syntactic Position." *Arabica* 25 (1978): 261–81.
——, "Freedom of the Speaker? The Term *ittisāʿ* and Related Notions in Arabic Grammar." In *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April-1 May 1987*, edited by K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter, 281–93. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990.
Wright, W. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. 3rd edition. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896–98.

DON'T BE ABSURD: THE TERM *MUḤĀL* IN SĪBAWAYHI'S *KITĀB*

Avigail S. Noy

Introduction

In this paper I offer a thorough investigation into the notion of *muḥāl* 'crooked; absurd' in Sībawayhi's (d. *ca*. 180/796) monumental *Kitāb*, in the hopes of shedding new light on the understanding of the term by the early and influential grammarian. The analysis of the term is undertaken by examining all of its occurrences in the *Kitāb* and by a conducting a close reading of the context in which the term *muḥāl* appears.[1]

We first come across the notion of *iḥāla* 'crookedness' in a very brief chapter in the preliminary sections of the *Kitāb* (the so-called *Risāla*) titled باب الاستقامة من الكلام والإحالة "On the Straightness and Crookedness of Utterances".[2] The chapter, which has received much interest in modern scholarly literature,[3] presents the reader with five 'correctness' or 'soundness' criteria that presumably encompass all utterance types. One of these

---

[1] I wish to thank Professor Wolfhart Heinrichs for reading an earlier version of this paper and for providing me with helpful comments and suggestions. Needless to say, any remaining shortcomings are solely mine.

[2] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 6, (1) ed. H. Derenbourg (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881) 1, 7, (2) ed. ʿA.S.M. Hārūn ([Cairo]: Dār al-Qalam, 1966–1977) 1, 25–6 (henceforth: *bāb al-istiqāma*).

[3] M.G. Carter, "Les Origines de la Grammaire Arabe," *Revues des Études Islamiques* 40 (1972): 81–4 (reprinted as "The Origins of Arabic Grammar," in *The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition*, ed. R. Baalbaki [Aldershot; Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 2007], 11–15); *idem*, "An Arab Grammarian of the Eighth Century A.D.: A Contribution to the History of Linguistics," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93.2 (1973): 146–57; *idem*, *Sībawayhi* (London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 61–65; G. Bohas, J.-P. Guillaume and D.E. Kouloughli, *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*, forwarded by M.G. Carter (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2006. Originally published: London, New York: Routledge, 1990), 40–2; T. Iványi, "*Qad yağūz fī sh-shiʿr*: On the Linguistic Background of the So Called Poetic Licenses in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*," in *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Grammar, Budapest 1–7 September 1991*, eds. K. Dévényi and T. Iványi = *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 3–4 (1991): 205; R. Baalbaki, *The Legacy of the Kitāb: Sībawahi's Analytical Methods within the Context of the Arabic Grammatical Theory* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2008), 9; A.E. Marogy, *Kitāb Sībawayhi: Syntax and Pragmatics* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010), 74–9; and P. Abboud, "Sībawayhi's Notion of Grammaticality," *al-ʿArabiyya* 12 (1979): 58–67 (which I was only recently made aware of by R. Talmon, "*Al-kalām mā kāna muktafiyan bi-nafsihī wa-huwa l-ğumla*: A Study in the History of Sentence-Concept and the Sībawaihian Legacy in Arabic Grammar," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 138 [1988]:

criteria is *muḥāl*. The others are a combination of two of the following terms: *mustaqīm* lit. 'straight' i.e. 'sound, correct', *muḥāl* lit. 'crooked' i.e. 'incorrect', *ḥasan* 'beautiful', *qabīḥ* 'ugly' or *kaḏib* 'false'; besides *muḥāl* these will mostly not concern us here.

I begin with an introductory section that presents medieval technical and lexical definitions of the term, as well as modern scholarly understandings thereof in Sībawayhi's work. I touch on the Greek and Legal Hypotheses regarding the origin of the term in grammatical thinking only to show that lexically, *muḥāl* inherently implies 'speech'. In the second section I lay out the two basic functions played by the term *muḥāl* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*, functions that operate on the assumption that sentences marked '*muḥāl*' do not occur in natural Bedouin speech. Sections three and four delve into each of the two functions of *muḥāl* by discussing instances of its usage. The last section offers concluding remarks by way of comparing the notion of *iḥāla* to the adjacent notion of *naqḍ* 'contradiction'.

The title of this paper is in fact misleading for Sībawayhi does not use *iḥāla* to refer to plain 'absurdity'. Rather, he employs ungrammatical, *muḥāl*-marked sentences as a tool for either *teaching* the reader a grammatical phenomenon or *proving* the validity of a pre-defined grammatical rule.[4]

1. Technical and Lexical Definitions of *Muḥāl*

One of the many merits of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* lies in its systematic employment of Arabic terminology at a time when Arabic as a scientific language was at its infancy. In this respect, my investigation into the term *muḥāl* should be seen as a small chapter in the history of the development of medieval Arabic technical terms. In order to frame our discussion in the larger context of medieval Arabic thought, we should keep in mind that *muḥāl* does *not* develop into a full-fledged technical term in later grammar, but does appear in the later adjacent sciences of philosophy and

74–98). For a literal translation of the chapter see G. Troupeau, "La *Risālat al-Kitāb* de Sībawayhi," *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 48 (1973): 337.

[4] I use the expression "*muḥāl*-marked sentences" to refer to stretches of speech that Sībawayhi says are *muḥāl*; there is no real 'marker'. Also, I have chosen the word "sentences" to refer to these stretches of speech, rather than "utterances", because they are not attested in native speech and are thus not "uttered" (see §2). I have placed an asterisk before these stretches of speech, which are ungrammatical.

literary theory (*naqd*).[5] One prevailing definition of the term *muḥāl* found both in philosophy and in some of the works on literary theory talks about "a co-occurrence of two contradictory [things] within the same object at the same time, in the same element [or] the same relative state" (جمع المتناقضين في شيء واحد في زمان واحد في جزء واحد وإضافة واحدة), such as describing an object as being both black and white at the same time.[6] As such, *muḥāl* is not only non-existent but also inconceivable (and the philosophers make the distinction between that which does not exist but is imaginable and that which does not exist and is unimaginable).[7]

[5] The term occurs in another early work of grammatical import, namely *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān* of al-Farrāʾ (d. 207/822); since it is limited to only two passages (4 occurrences in all cited by Kinberg), we would hesitate to refer to it as a technical term. Kinberg translates *muḥāl* as "solecistic, impossible, construction, combination, etc."; see N. Kinberg, *A Lexicon of al-Farrāʾ's Terminology in his Qurʾān Commentary: With Full Definitions, English Summaries and Extensive Citations* (Leiden, New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 196. al-Farrāʾ's usage of *muḥāl* might be comparable to that of Sībawayhi, but one would need additional textual evidence to be sure.

[6] This definition is taken from the technical dictionary of al-Ḫuwārizmī (d. 387/997–8), *Kitāb mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm*, ed. G. van Vloten (Lugduni-Batavorum: Brill, 1895), 140, under the chapter of philosophy (the text reads واضافة واحد instead of واحدة). Definitions to this effect are stated by the early philosopher al-Kindī (d. *ca.* 256/873) and the literary critic Qudāma b. Jaʿfar (d. between 320/932 and 337/948) and can be found in later technical dictionaries and books of definitions. For al-Kindī's definition in his *Risāla fī ḥudūd al-ašyāʾ wa-rusūmihā* see J. Jihāmī, *Mawsūʿat muṣṭalaḥāt al-falsafa ʿinda al-ʿArab*, *Silsilat Mawsūʿāt al-Muṣṭalaḥāt al-ʿArabiyya wa-l-Islāmiyya* (Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān, 1998), 774; for Qudāma's definition see his *Kitāb naqd al-šiʿr*, ed. S.A. Bonebakker (Leiden: Brill, 1956), 124 (under the sub-heading الاستحالة والتناقض "absurdity and self-contradiction", 124–33); for a later typical philosophical definition see al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413), *Kitāb al-taʿrīfāt* (Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān, 1969), 217. The example الجسم أسود أبيض في حال واحدة is given by the literary critic Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (d. *ca.* 395/1005) in his *al-Furūq fī al-luġa*, ed. Lajnat Iḥyāʾ al-Turāṯ al-ʿArabī (Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadīda, 1983), 34–5. The term *iḍāfa* in its philosophical sense refers to a state that is by nature continuously relative or analogous to something else (*Taʿrīfāt*, 28–9), such as 'fatherhood' (inherently suggests 'son') or 'slavehood' (inherently suggests 'owner').

[7] For the 'non-existent' aspect of *muḥāl* see Jihāmī, *Mawsūʿa*, 774. Qudāma distinguishes between *mumtaniʿ* 'impossible' and *mutanāqiḍ* 'self-contradictory' (or *mustaḥīl* [used by Qudāma interchangeably with *muḥāl*], so we infer from his sub-heading الاستحالة والتناقض), stating that the former cannot come into existence (لا يكون) but may be conceived in the imagination (يمكن تصوُّره في الوهم), while the latter is non-existent but also inconceivable (Qudāma, *Naqd*, 133; also Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī, *Furūq*, 35). Interestingly, Qudāma contrasts *muḥāl*/*mustaḥīl* (or *mutanāqiḍ*) with *mustaqīm* (e.g. *Naqd*, 125). For a subdivision of poetic hyperbole based on the distinction *mumkin-mumtaniʿ-mustaḥīl* (the latter translated as 'unthinkable') see W. Heinrichs, "Mubālag̲h̲a," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, eds. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (Brill, 2011. Brill Online, Harvard University), accessed September 19, 2011, http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=islam_COM-1438 (henceforth: *EI*²). Utterances are sometimes later classified according to the philosophically-inspired modal distinction

It would seem at first from Sībawayhi's quasi-definition of *muḥāl* given in his *bāb al-istiqāma* that it is the same self-contradictory sense that stands at the basis of the term in its grammatical application: وأما المحال فأن تنقض أول كلامك بآخره "*muḥāl* is contradicting the beginning of your utterance with its end".[8] The archetypal examples allegedly corroborate this: أتيتك غدا* "I came to you tomorrow" and سآتيك أمس* "I will come to you yesterday". Indeed, modern Western scholars have understood Sībawayhi's *muḥāl* in a logical or semantic sense: Carter makes the distinction between 'semantic' and 'structural' correctness, as he understands the *istiqāma-iḥāla* pairing to reside in the former;[9] according to Versteegh, "the category of 'correctness' (*mustaqīm*) [is used] in a logical sense";[10] according to Mosel, similar to Carter, *mustaqīm* does not mean "grammatisch richtig", i.e. *ḥasan*, but rather "ein sinnvoller verständlicher Satz" (= semantic/logical sense);[11] and going further back to Jahn, it is not clear whether he sees *mustaqīm* as "grammatisch richtig" (= structural/formal correctness) or as "dem Sinne nach angemessen" (= semantic/logical correctness) because on one hand he contrasts *muḥāl* with "dem Sinne nach angemessen" and renders it "dem Sinne nach verkehrt" (= logical) but on the other hand *mustaqīm* is translated throughout as "grammatisch richtig" (= structural/formal).[12] Interestingly, Owens identifies the archetypal *muḥāl*-sentences as "grammatically acceptable" in that they exhibit structural correctness: verb + agent + object + circumstantial complement.[13]

---

wājib-jāʾiz-mumtaniʿ 'necessary-possible-impossible'; e.g. Ibn Fāris (d.395/1004), *al-Ṣāḥibī fī fiqh al-luġa wa-sunan al-ʿarab fī kalāmihā*, ed. M. al-Chouémi (Beirut: Muʾassasat Badrān li-l-Ṭibāʿa wa-l-Našr, 1963), 179, al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), *Kitāb al-iqtirāḥ fī ʿilm uṣūl al-naḥw* (Hyderabad: Jamʿiyyat Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUṯmāniyya, 1940), 14 (quoting Ibn al-Ṭarāwa, d. 528/1134). I thank Professor Michael Carter for these references and hope to elaborate on these and other classifications, found in *naqd* works, elsewhere.

8 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 6, Derenbourg 1, 7/Hārūn 1, 25.

9 Carter, *Sībawayhi*, 61; *idem*, "An Arab Grammarian," 148; Marogy (*Kitāb Sībawayhi*, 74–9) accentuates the pragmatic role played by the *istiqāma-iḥāla* pairing.

10 K. Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar and Qurʾānic Exegesis in Early Islam* (Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1993), 34.

11 U. Mosel, *Die Syntaktische Terminologie bei Sībawayh* (Munich: Dissertations—und Fotodrück Frank, 1975), 17, n. 1.

12 G. Jahn, *Sībawaihi's Buch über die Grammatik: Übersetzt und Erklärt* (Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1895) 1, 10–11. Instances of this inconsistency (parentheses are Jahn's): category (i) of Sībawayhi's soundness hierarchy is rendered "was (grammatisch) richtig und (dem Sinne nach) angemessen ist" (*mustaqīm ḥasan*); category (iv): "was (grammatisch) richtig, aber (der Wortstellung nach) incorrect ist" (*mustaqīm qabīḥ*); category (v): "was (dem Sinne nach) verkehrt und (dem Inhalt nach) eine Lüge ist" (*muḥāl kaḏib*).

13 J. Owens, *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory* (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988), 228. Cf. Chomsky's *grammatical* "Colourless green ideas sleep furiously", as grammatical-

That Sībawayhi's sense of *muḥāl* was not obvious even to his successors is evident from the account given by his commentator Abū Saʿīd al-Sīrāfī (d. *ca.* 368/979). In expounding on *muḥāl* al-Sīrāfī stays true to the 'philosophical' understanding of the term,[14] while its antipode *mustaqīm* takes on a more 'formal' sense (cf. Jahn) as it is glossed مستقيم اللفظ والإعراب "having sound form and sound declension/verbal-mood", i.e. "permissible in the Bedouins' speech, without [necessarily] being preferable" (أن يكون جائزا في كلام العرب دون أن يكون مختارا).[15] In fact what I hope this paper will show is that in Sībawayhi's *application* of the term, *muḥāl* simply means 'ungrammatical' and should be taken as the opposite of al-Sīrāfī's understanding of *mustaqīm*: i.e. غير جائز "impermissible". Moreover, this impermissibility or ungrammaticality is best described, in the Sībawayian context, as a syntactic one.[16]

By following Sībawayhi's actual usage of the term *muḥāl* we are initially finding out whether its application "conforms to the definition"[17] but are consequently unravelling additional aspects of the analytical-theoretical, as well as pedagogical mechanisms that are employed by Sībawayhi. Such an approach, applied to the other correctness-categories, could potentially yield a better understanding of Sībawayhi's views on grammaticality and value judgements of utterances.[18]

---

ity for him "cannot be identified with 'meaningful' or 'significant' in any semantic sense" (N. Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* ['s-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957], 15). As will be shown, the ungrammaticality of the *muḥāl* archetypes lies within the verb's *tense*: i.e. it is the verb-conjugation that is incorrect.

14 al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, eds. R. ʿAbd al-Tawwāb, M.F. Ḥijāzī and M.H. ʿAbd al-Dāyim ([Cairo]: al-Hayʾa al-Miṣriyya al-ʿĀmma li-l-Kitāb, 1986) 2, 90 ff.

15 al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ* 2, 89–90. The term *jāʾiz* here should be taken in its most basic lexical sense and should not be confused with any philosophical sense thereof (*viz. mumkin*, cf. n. 7). Carter ("Les Origines," 84) suggests that the term *jāʾiz* was taken up from law; he understands a *jāʾiz*-utterance to be both *ḥasan* and *mustaqīm*.

16 It would perhaps be inaccurate to assign the incorrectness of an utterance to one linguistic level (e.g. semantic, pragmatic) as all linguistic levels are one and the same for Sībawayhi (on the "inseparability of form and meaning" in the *Kitāb* see Baalbaki, *Legacy*, 170–91, esp. 173 [wherefrom I quote], 181, 187. To 'form' and 'meaning' we should add 'context' to account for the pragmatic dimension of many of Sībawayhi's analyses; see e.g. Bohas et al., *Arabic Linguistic Tradition*, 42–3). In the case of *muḥāl*-marked sentences, we will see that Sībawayhi explains their ungrammaticality primarily in structural or syntactic terms.

17 Carter, "An Arab Grammarian," 148. He states: "As used in the Book these criteria [the 'behavioural criteria', p. 147; i.e. categories of speech-correctness] entirely conform to the definitions given to them". As will be shown in what follows, this is not the case with regards to *muḥāl*.

18 Thus, I would not be quick to rely on Sībawayhi's archetypal *qabīḥ*-example, say, given in his *bāb al-istiqāma* in order to evaluate the term. A scrutiny of the terms *ḥasan* and *qabīḥ* throughout the *Kitāb* would be a much more extended undertaking, as their

Since one cannot attend to the *istiqāma-iḥāla* discourse without invoking the Greek Hypothesis or Legal Hypothesis regarding the origin of these terms,[19] I should say that I subscribe to neither, at least in the case of *muḥāl*. A brief lexical survey of the word suffices to show that we need not view *muḥāl* as the opposite of an ethically-charged *mustaqīm*[20] nor as the Arabic counterpart to the Greek *adúnatos*,[21] as *muḥāl* seems to have originally applied to *speech*, rather than *things* or *ideas*. According to Ibn Manẓūr (d. 630/1311–2), it is said that the verbs حال (form I) and استحال (form X) may refer to "anything that is altered from straightness (استواء) to crookedness (عوج)", wherefrom the adjectives مستحيل and مستحال "crooked, uneven, distorted, twisted" are derived.[22] The word *muḥāl*, however, signifies a 'crookedness' that solely applies to speech, such that the verbs حوّل (form II) and أحال (form IV) derive from it: والمحال من الكلام ما عُدل به عن وجهه وحوّله جعله محالا وأحال أتى بمحال "*muḥāl* (speech): that which is turned away/deviated from its [right/natural] way;[23] *ḥawwala* [transitive]: to make s.t.

---

appearance in the work is several-fold that of *muḥāl*. In the case of *kaḏib*, besides its occurrences in the introductory chapter, the notion is absent from the *Kitāb*. The term *mustaqīm* will be scrutinized in this paper only inasmuch as it corroborates our conclusions regarding *muḥāl*.

[19] For a neat presentation of these hypotheses, as well as the Syriac connection regarding the origins of the Arabic grammatical tradition, see Versteegh, *Grammar and Exegesis*, 22–36 and recently Baalbaki, introduction to *Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition*, xx–xxvii. With regards to the speech soundness criteria, Versteegh seems to support the Greek hypothesis (*Grammar and Exegesis*, 35) while Baalbaki seems to support the legal one (*Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition*, xxv).

[20] E.g. M.G. Carter, "The Ethical Basis of Arabic Grammar," *al-Karmil* 12 (1991): 12.

[21] Versteegh, *Grammar and Exegesis*, 24 (following Rundgren).

[22] Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, n.d.) 2, 1054. مستحيل and مستحال are commonly said of a bow (قوس) and of the edges of a thigh/leg (or a person who has a 'twisted' thigh/leg; ibid.). Seemingly, both the active and the passive participles are synonymous: this may explained by the fact that many form X verbs are "at least originally, reflexive" (thus the agent, that is the "active", and the patient, that is the "passive", are the same); see W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, revised by W.R. Smith and M.J. de Goeje (3rd edition reprint; n.p.: Simon WallenbergPress, 2007) 1, 45 (one example Wright adduces is استقام "*to stand upright* lit. *to hold oneself upright*" [ibid.; italics his]). We also find 'straightness' and 'crookedness' in the most profane of contexts (*viz.* far from having moral/ethical import), as the following proverb and explanation thereof suggests (Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* 2, 1054): و في المثل ذاك أحوَلُ من بول الجمل وذلك أنّ البول لا يخرج مستقيما يذهب في إحدى الناحيتين "Proverbially [it is said:] *That is more crooked/twisted than a camel's urination*, and this is [said] because its urine does not come out straight going in one of the two directions [right and left]". This proverb should not be confused with هو أحول من ذئب, derived from حيلة: "He is more cunning than a wolf" (stated several entries later; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* 2, 1055).

[23] al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī mentions a lexical definition to this effect (*Taʿrīfāt*, 217) but does not limit it to 'speech'. Cf. some of the definitions of the verbs لحن and لغى as "deviating

muḥāl; aḥāla [intransitive]: to utter *muḥāl*".[24] Linguistically, it should be said, form IV verbs in Arabic (here أحال) comprise many denominatives, such that they "combine with the idea of the noun, from which they are derived, that of a transitive verb, of which it is the direct object".[25] Similarly, form II verbs (here حوّله) are frequently denominative and "express [...] the *making* or *doing of* [...] the thing expressed by the noun from which it is derived".[26] In other words, the grammar of the language (in terms of the semantics of verb-forms) supports Ibn Manẓūr's synopsis. Notice that whereas مستحيل would be used adjectivally to modify the word كلام "speech", the word محال intrinsically implies it: وكلام مستحيل محال "[The meaning of] *mustaḥīl* speech [is] *muḥāl*".[27] In what way is speech "crooked/twisted"? This question remains unexplained in the *Lisān*.[28]

It is here that we find the speech-classification attributed to Sībawayhi's most prominent teacher, al-Ḫalīl b. Aḥmad (d. between 159/776 and 173/791), opening thus (on the authority of Ibn Shumayl [d. 203/818?]): المحال الكلام لغير شيء والمستقيم كلام لشيء "*muḥāl* is the saying/speech for a non-thing and *mustaqīm* is the saying/speech for a thing".[29] It is not clear

---

from the correct [way]" in T. Iványi, "*Laḥn* and *Luġa*," *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 1 (1988): 67–9.

24 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* 2, 1055.

25 Wright, *Grammar* 1, 34–5. Wright adds that in these cases the verb would often be intransitive (as is أحال). Of the many examples provided by Wright are أبقل "to produce herbage [بقل]" or أبلغ "to speak eloquently [with بلاغة]". What is a bit strange in our case of أحال "to produce 'crooked speech' [محال]" is that the noun itself is a derivative of form IV (passive participle). The only comparable example I found in Wright was أمكن "to become possible", the noun from which it is derived being ممكن, the active participle of form IV. Regarding the intransitivity of أحال, it should be noted that Ibn Manẓūr does record a possible usage of the verb as a transitive one; i.e. it could be used with the complement 'speech': وأحال أتى بمحال... ويقال أحلت الكلام أحيله إحالة إذا أفسدته "*aḥāla*: to utter *muḥāl* [...] and it is said *aḥaltu l-kalāma* 'I make speech *muḥāl*' (+conjugations): when you corrupt it [speech]" (Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* 2, 1055).

26 Wright, *Grammar* 1, 32; italics his (cf. Ibn Manẓūr's wording, جعله محالا).

27 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* 2, 1055.

28 According to one definition it exhibits فساد "corruption" (see n. 25), but what *exactly* is corrupt in the speech is still unclear to me.

29 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* 2, 1055. This classification is not found in al-Ḫalīl's extant work, *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*, and is more in line with the criteria stated by al-Aḫfaš ('al-Awsaṭ', d. *ca.* 215/830, credited with making the *Kitāb* widely known) and by Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī (d. 377/987), in that all three are additionally concerned with subjective lies and inadvertent errors. The views of al-Aḫfaš are recorded by al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ* 2, 94 and by al-Šantamarī (d. 476/1083), *al-Nukat fī tafsīr Kitāb Sībawayhi*, ed. Z.ʿA.M. Sulṭān (Kuwait: Maʿhad al-Maḫṭūṭāt al-ʿArabiyya, al-Munaẓamma al-ʿArabiyya li-l-Tarbiya wa-l-Ṯaqāfa wa-l-ʿUlūm, 1987) 1, 134; and see Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī, *Aqsām al-akhbār*, ed. ʿA.J. al-Manṣūrī, *al-Mawrid* 7.3 (1978): 202–4. The entry *muḥāl* in *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*, eds. M. al-Maḫzūmī and I. al-Samārrāʾī

whether this 'definition' should be taken in the philosophical-logical sense (as in Versteegh: "Impossible is speech about something that does not exist")[30] or whether it should be seen as a more basic lexical explanation, in which case the English "nonsense" could be an appropriate literal rendering of *muḥāl*'s "speech for a non-thing". It is nevertheless apparent from Ibn Manẓūr's account that he preserves an earlier, speech-bound sense of *muḥāl*; this is while the semantically-extended sense of the word seems to have become standard among many of the lexicographers preceding him (Ibn Manẓūr does not mention the 'logical' definition).[31] An explicit statement concerning this issue is made by Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (d. *ca.* 395/1005) in his semantically-organized dictionary *al-Furūq fī al-luġa*, according to whom "our saying *muḥāl* pertains only to speech/utterances" (وقولنا محال لا يدخل إلا في الكلام). As his explanation goes, the theologians (متكلمون) use the term to refer to a nonexistent attribute (صفة), although lexically (في اللغة) it refers to the "utterance" of the one making the attribute (قول الواصف).[32]

Also noteworthy is the fact that the notions of 'straightness' and 'bentness/crookedness'—though not in terms of *iḥāla*—are used long before Sībawayhi to *critically* apply to speech (poetic speech, to be exact). This can be attested by the following poetry line by the Umayyad ʿAdiyy b. al-Riqāʿ (d. *ca.* 95/714) (in the *kāmil* meter): وقصيدةٍ قد بِتُّ أجمع بينها \\ حتّى أقوِّمَ ميلَها وسنادَها "many a *qaṣīda* I would spend all night revising (lit. assembling its [scattered parts]) until I straightened out what was bent/crooked

([Baghdad]: al-Jumhūriyya al-ʿIrāqiyya, Wizārat al-Ṯaqāfa wa-l-Iʿlām, Dār al-Rašīd, 1980–1985) 3, 298 is much less informative than the account given by Ibn Manẓūr.

[30] Versteegh, *Grammar and Exegesis*, 34.

[31] Lane preserves the speech-bound sense only with regards to استحال: "it (speech, language or thing) became *muḥāl*" (E.W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* [New-Delhi: Asian Educational Studies, 1985], 675); أحال according to him may refer either to a saying or to an action; محال is rendered "absurd, inconsistent, self-contradictory, unreal, impossible" (*Lexicon*, 674). Hava distinguishes between speech-bound and non-speech-bound *muḥāl*, as his entry of the word reads: "Absurd (speech); Crooked; Impossible" (J.G. Hava, *al-Farāʾid: Arabic-English Dictionary*, 5th ed. [Beirut: Dār al-Mašriq, 1982], 151). *Kitāb al-ʿayn* (3, 298) does preserve the speech-bound sense of *muḥāl* (but here it is derived from the verb حوّل, rather than the other way around). In al-Zamaḫšarī's (d. 538/1144) 'thesaurus' and figurative dictionary *Asās al-balāgha* we find *mustaqīm* and *muḥāl* being said of *things*: وشيء مستقيم ومحال (no further definition); *Asās al-balāgha*, eds. M. Nuʿaym and Š. al-Maʿarrī ([Baghdad]: al-Jumhūriyya al-ʿIrāqiyya, Wizārat al-Ṯaqāfa wa-l-Iʿlām, Dār al-Rašīd, 1980–1985), 177. For al-Zamaḫšarī it is from *this* adjective that the verb أحال—when applied to *things said* (كلام, قول)—is derived.

[32] *Furūq*, 35. Notice that al-ʿAskarī is attending to the speech-bound sense of *muḥāl* parenthetically; his point of departure is the 'philosophical' sense of *muḥāl* and it is the latter aspect that receives most of his attention.

and corrupt".[33] Statements like these, and the fact that *muḥāl* intrinsically refers to speech, would seem to render the 'legal' understanding of the term irrelevant.

To conclude this section, it is important that we identify the distinction between the philosophical-logical and what was to become standard sense of *muḥāl*, namely 'absurd, impossible', and the lexical speech-bound sense thereof, namely 'nonsense' (or 'crooked', inherently implying speech). Even though Sībawayhi's quasi-definition of *muḥāl* seems to reflect the former, it is indeed the latter from which the term in its technical grammatical sense develops. If at all 'foreign' influences are to be found, they may lie in the quasi-definition itself. In what follows we shall see that throughout the *Kitāb*, the term is used in a systematic, grammatical and indeed technical way. In the context of the *Kitāb* the term *muḥāl* is best rendered 'ungrammatical'.[34]

2. *Muḥāl*-Marked Sentences in the *Kitāb* as Hypothetical Speech

As recorded by Troupeau, the term *muḥāl* appears 45 times in the *Kitāb*, with an additional 10 occurrences of the variants *aḥāla* 'to utter *muḥāl*', *istaḥāla* 'to be *muḥāl*', *muḥīl* 'uttering *muḥāl*' and *iḥāla* 'the state of being *muḥāl*'.[35] In most of these occurrences *muḥāl* is used by Sībawayhi as a 'tag' referring to sentences. In a minority of occurrences, however, *muḥāl* is used in the sense that befits the later standard sense of the word, *viz.*

[33] *Dīwān shiʿr ʿadiyy b. al-riqāʿ al-ʿāmilī*, eds. N.Ḥ. al-Qaysī and Ḥ.Ṣ. al-Ḍāmin ([Baghdad]: Maṭbaʿat al-Majmaʿ al-ʿIlmī al-ʿIrāqī, 1987), 88; M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Ibn Qutayba, *Introduction au Livre de la poésie et des poets, Muqaddimatu kitābi l-šiʿr wa-l-šuʿarāʾ: Texte arabe d'après l'édition De Goeje. Avec introduction, traduction et commentaire par Gaudefroy-Demombynes* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947), 17. What precisely *sinād* refers to is not agreed upon, except that it is a fault in poetry (*ʿayb*); *Dīwān*, 88, *Lisān* 3, 2115. I was made aware of this line by Heinrichs, "Naḳd" *EI*², who paraphrases the line when discussing critical vocabulary found in poetry during the pre-systematic stage of literary criticism.

[34] Or: 'ungrammatical sentence', see below. It should be noted that *muḥāl* (or *mustaḥīl*) does not appear in the Qurʾān nor does it show up in the poetry of six prominent pre-Islamic poets; see A. Arazi and S. Masalha, *al-ʿIqd al-ṯamīn fī dawāwīn al-šuʿarāʾ al-sitta al-jāhilīn* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Institute of Asian and African Studies, 1999).

[35] G. Troupeau, *Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1976), 75–6, who translates *muḥāl* as "absurde, impossible". I exclude *istaḥāla* in the sense of "trouver absurde, impossible" (2 occurrences) as they do not refer directly to sentences. Note: in the following references to Derenbourg's edition of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* I specify the line number only if the term *muḥāl* appears more than once on the same page.

‘impossible’. Thus we find comments like “it is impossible for you to assign the *rafʿ* ‘independent case marker’ to [a word in a sentence] on account of [another word in that sentence]”.[36] I call this the ‘non-technical’ use of the term.[37] My investigation is limited to the ‘technical’ use of the term, and my conclusions are a result of a close examination, not only of all of the sentences marked as *muḥāl*, but also (and especially) of the context in which Sībawayhi adduces them. We should keep in mind that *iḥāla* occurs on the level of the sentence (or stretch of speech, *kalām*), not the single word; meaning, ungrammaticality on the morphological or phonological level would not be deemed *muḥāl*. So much so that *muḥāl* is contrasted at one point with *kalām* (cf. al-Ḫalīl’s utterance-classification): فهو كلام في الاستفهام محال في الإخبار “it [a certain construction] is a [valid] utterance as an interrogative but ungrammatical as a declarative sentence” (emphasis mine).[38] More important is the fact that *muḥāl* may be contrasted with *ḥasan* (what is commonly rendered ‘well-formed’, i.e. structurally sound);[39] what Sībawayhi probably means here is *ḥasan* in the (non-technical?) sense of ‘fine, permissible’. This may explain why we further find the contrast of *muḥāl* with *yajūzu* ‘is permissible’ (and cf. al-Sīrāfī’s understanding of *mustaqīm* as أن يكون جائزا في كلام العرب). Examples of the *muḥāl-ḥasan* juxtaposition (all emphases are mine): فهو على وجه محال وعلى وجه حسن “it is ungrammatical in one sense/aspect but ‘fine’ [i.e. grammatical] in another”;[40] وإنّما ذكر الخليل هذا لتعرف ما يحال منه وما يحسُن “al-Ḫalīl mentioned this only in order for you to know/distinguish what is ungrammatical of [a certain construction] from what is grammatical”;[41] ولو لم تضمرها لكان الكلام محالا . . . فإذا أضمرت أن

[36] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 110, Derenbourg 1, 200/Hārūn 2, 35 (but cf. the alternative reading in Hārūn). This case should not be confused with فهذا محال أن ترفع, which I understand to mean that the pronunciation of the *u*-ending is deemed ungrammatical (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 240, Derenbourg 1, 372/Hārūn 3, 26).

[37] Another example could be هذا محال with regards to the *idea* of “notifying him [the listener] that he is none other than himself” (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 205, Derenbourg 1, 332/Hārūn 2, 355). A gray area consists of statements like “it is *muḥāl* for you to say [. . .]”, where the sense could be either non-technical “it is impossible to say [. . .]” or technical “it is ungrammatical to say [. . .]” (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 145, Derenbourg 1, 259/Hārūn 2, 177; chapter 146, Derenbourg 1, 263/ Hārūn 2, 184; chapter 146, Derenbourg 1, 264/Hārūn 2, 187 [two instances of *muḥāl*]). I count these as technical instances of the term.

[38] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 224, Derenbourg 1, 353/Hārūn 2, 406; cf. Talmon, “*Kalām*,” 84. Talmon analyzes the term *kalām* in the *Kitāb* (p. 82 ff.), seeing it essentially as a non-syntactic term; on its basic tenet as “acceptable speech” see Iványi, “Poetic Licenses,” 211.

[39] “All the structural features of Arabic, from the level of the phoneme to the sentence, are evaluated as either *ḥasan* or *qabīḥ* [and the like]” (Carter, “An Arab Grammarian,” 148).

[40] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 103, Derenbourg 1, 186/Hārūn 1, 439.

[41] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 117, Derenbourg 1, 219/Hārūn 2, 80. For discussion see §3.

حَسُنَ الكلام "had you not suppressed it [the particle *ʾan*], the utterance would have been ungrammatical […] and if you suppress *ʾan*, the utterance is fine".[42] Examples of the *muḥāl-yajūzu* juxtaposition: ولو قلت ... كان محالا ... فلم يجز ذا وجاز على الابتداء "had you said [sentence] it would have been ungrammatical […] and this is not permissible but it is permissible as a [constituent] opening [the sentence]";[43] فيستحيل في وجه ويجوز في وجه "it is ungrammatical in one sense but permissible in another".[44]

Probably the most important aspect of *muḥāl*-marked sentences is that the vast majority of them do not reflect actual Bedouin speech but are rather the result of the grammarian's forged speech. In fact, we only find one clear-cut instance of a natural sentence being tagged as *muḥāl*, but this is put in the mouth of al-Ḫalīl, not Sībawayhi (see below).[45] Most of the occurrences follow a formulaic لو قلت ... كان محالا (sometimes: ...لأنّ) "had you said X, it would have been ungrammatical (because P)" (X=sentence, P=grammatical phenomenon or rule), thus exhibiting hypothetical sentences that *were not said*.[46] One variant is ولو قلت ...وأنت تريد ... كان محالا "had

---

[42] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 234, Derenbourg 1, 362/Hārūn 3, 3.

[43] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 270, Derenbourg 1, 420/ Hārūn 3, 144 [and see n. 1].

[44] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 224, Derenbourg 1, 353/Hārūn 3, 406. Cf. على وجه محال وعلى وجه حسن. Notice also the contrast *mustaqīm-ghayr jāʾiz*: وإن أردت...فهو غير جائز وإن...وأردت... فهو مستقيم "if you mean […], it is impermissible, but if […] and you mean […], then it is correct [i.e. grammatical]"; Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 251, Derenbourg 1, 395/Hārūn 3, 84 (emphasis mine).

[45] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 92, Derenbourg 1, 167/Hārūn 1, 395. In two other cases it is equivocal whether or not *muḥāl* is referring to actual sentences. One is لا يجوز...وذلك قولك...فهذا محال (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 113, Derenbourg 211/Hārūn 2, 59): ذلك قولك could be interpreted as the sentence that exemplifies what is "not allowed" (لا يجوز) and not as a natural utterance (thus we would translate it as "That *would* be your saying […]"); conversely, if we do take قولك to represent "your saying", i.e. a natural utterance, we should be alerted to the fact that this argument, too, is attributed to al-Ḫalīl, as it concludes with the words وهذا قول الخليل (chapter 113, Derenbourg 211/Hārūn 2, 59) (for a discussion of the grammatical question at hand see Carter, "An Arab Grammarian," 149–50). The second case is وأما...فهو محال "as for [sentence], it is ungrammatical" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 224, Derenbourg 1, 353 [l. 21]/Hārūn 2, 406), but from the context it is inferred that this sentence too is nonfactual.

[46] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 101, Derenbourg 1, 184/Hārūn 1, 135; chapter 224, Derenbourg 1, 353 (ll. 12–13)/Hārūn 2, 405; chapter 240, Derenbourg 1, 372/Hārūn 3, 26–27; chapter 254, Derenbourg 1, 403/Hārūn 3, 103; chapter 270, Derenbourg 1, 420/Hārūn 3, 133–4 (two separate instances). Not all occurrences follow the formula literally but they essentially express the same idea. The interlocutors in al-Sīrāfī's discussion of *bāb al-istiqāma* (*Šarḥ* 2, 90), who object to Sībawayhi's use of the word *muḥāl*, miss in fact this exact point by interpreting the sentences أتيتك غدا and سآتيك أمس as utterances that *exist* (كلام موجود). Indeed, they may exist as poetic utterances, but this is not reflected in the *Kitāb*. Already Abboud ("Grammaticality," 61) alerts to the fact that *muḥāl* sentences do not occur in actual speech

you said X while intending Y, then it [X] would have been ungrammatical" (X could represent a grammatical sentence here).[47]

The cause for adducing a nonfactual, non-grammatical sentence seems to fall within one of the following two reasons: either (a) to *explain* or *describe* a grammatical rule/behaviour or (b) to *justify* the rule and to provide *proof* (*dalīl*) to its validity.[48] Cases that fall under the second reason tend to follow a formulaic (sometimes opening with ألا ترى) والدليل (/مما يدلّك) على أنّ...أنك لو قلت... كان محالا "(don't you see) the indication/that which indicates to you that P is that had you said X, it would have been ungrammatical" (alternatively: simply "P because X is ungrammatical").[49]

That *muḥāl*-marked sentences are unattested in the speech of the Bedouins is somewhat reminiscent of the *tamṯīl*-type sequences which are explicitly glossed by Sībawayhi as لا يُتكلم به "not spoken".[50] However, the

(Talmon similarly does so with sequences of speech tagged لم يكن كلاما "is not a [valid] utterance"; Talmon, "*Kalām*," 83). Cf. Iványi's take on *law qulta*-utterances (utterances preceded by the words "had you said", Iványi, "Poetic Licenses," 201–4): if they are tagged "bad or ugly", they "are (sometimes) used in speech" (p. 202; Iványi's parentheses). Note that in his view, all "actual" utterances adduced by Sībawayhi do not reflect everyday Bedouin speech but rather everyday *ruwāt* or "so-called Bedouin" speech (Iványi, "Poetic Licenses," 204).

47 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 112, Derenbourg 1, 209/Hārūn 2, 55; chapter 177, Derenbourg 1, 219 (ll. 17–18)/Hārūn 2, 81; chapter 145, Derenbourg 1, 259/Hārūn 2, 177 (two instances); chapter 194, Derenbourg 1, 322–3/Hārūn 2, 331; chapter 205, Derenbourg 1, 331–2/Hārūn 2, 355 (if we interpret *muḥāl* as a technical term); chapter 241, Derenbourg 1, 372 (l. 20)/Hārūn 3, 28 (though *istaḥāla* could be interpreted here in its non-technical sense. Note that *istḥāla* in the following line is a clear case of non-technical usage); chapter 244, Derenbourg 1, 383/Hārūn 3, 55 (two instances); chapter 247, Derenbourg 1, 390/Hārūn 3, 72–3 (two separate instances). Not all occurrences follow the formula literally.

48 Cf. Baalbaki, *Legacy*, 133: "[...] Sībawayhi was interested not only in describing linguistic phenomena but also in justifying them".

49 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 110, Derenbourg 1, 199/Hārūn 2, 32; chapter 118, Derenbourg 1, 220/Hārūn 2, 81 (*muḥāl* could be interpreted here in its non-technical sense); chapter 141, Derenbourg 1, 255/Hārūn 2, 168; chapter 146, Derenbourg 1, 263/Hārūn 2, 184; chapter 146, Derenbourg 1, 264/Hārūn 2, 187 (put in the mouth of al-Ḫalīl. According to my understanding, it is used as a sarcastic [!] proof to denounce a dialectal variant); chapter 193, Derenbourg 1, 322/Hārūn 2, 331; chapter 194, Derenbourg 322–3/Hārūn 2, 331; chapter 208, Derenbourg 1, 334/Hārūn 2, 361–2; chapter 220, Derenbourg 1, 349/Hārūn 2, 394–5; chapter 224, Derenbourg 1, 353 (ll. 21–22)/Hārūn 2, 406 (here P="X is *muḥāl*"); chapter 239, Derenbourg 1, 370/Hārūn 3, 23; chapter 247, Derenbourg 1, 390 (ll. 6–7)/Hārūn 3, 72–3; chapter 251, Derenbourg 1, 395/Hārūn 3, 84 (note that *muḥāl* is equated with *lam yajuz*); chapter 252, Derenbourg 1, 397/Hārūn 3, 88; chapter 253, Derenbourg 1, 400/Hārūn 3, 97; chapter 278, Derenbourg 1, 432/Hārūn 3, 169. Once more, these need not follow the formula literally but their function as providing a *dalīl* still holds.

50 See G. Ayoub, "De ce qui 'ne se dit pas' dans le Livre de Sībawayhi: La Notion de *Tamṯīl*," in *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*, eds. K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1990), 1–15, esp. p 11. She rightly notes that *muḥāl* is a criterion of admissibility (p. 12, n. 3).

function played by *muḥāl*-marked sentences is markedly different from that played by *tamṯīl*- (or *ka-annaka qulta*- 'as if you said') sentences in that the purpose of the *muḥāl* sentence is not to explain a case/mood marker whose cause is not manifest in the sentence. Only two of the *muḥāl*-marked sentences do in fact coincide with *tamṯīl* and reflect an 'underlying structure' intended to 'manifest' or 'bring to the senses' the cause for the case/mood marker. The first is (explaining the *naṣb* 'dependent case' after, what later grammarians call *wāw al-maʿiyya*): . . . كأنك قلت ما صنعت أخاك وهذا محال ولكن أردت أن أمثّل لك "As if you had said [with regards to the sentence *What did you do with your brother*(-dependent)] **What did you do your brother*, and this is ungrammatical but I wanted to bring [it] to your senses".[51] The second case is assuming an implied verb to explain the *naṣb* in الحذرَ الحذرَ "be careful" or النجاءَ النجاءَ "get away/save yourself".[52] By contrast, the vast majority of ungrammatical sentences tagged as *muḥāl* are adduced to serve one of the two functions mentioned above. The first function (*viz.* 'explanation and description') takes place on the level of 'acquisition' of the language: the reader may or may not identify the sentence as ungrammatical, hence its pedagogical import; the second function (*viz*. 'proof') takes place on the level of theory: Sībawayhi relies on the fact that the reader will identify the sentence as ungrammatical, otherwise the proof is ineffectual.

Before we delve into the two distinct functions played by *muḥāl*-marked sentences, let us attend to the occurrence of a *muḥāl*-marked sentence that represents a natural utterance. Within the chapter dealing with non-adjective and non-*maṣdar* adverbial dependents,[53] Sībawayhi cites al-Ḫalīl's rejection of ربحت الدرهمَ درهمًا "I got a profit of one dirham on every dirham" and the ensuing debate among Bedouins (العرب):

> وزعم الخليل أنّ قولهم ربحت الدرهمَ درهمًا محال حتى تقول في الدرهم أو للدرهم وكذلك وجدنا العرب تقول فإن قال قائل فأَحذف حرف الجر وأَنوه قيل له لا يجوز ذلك كما لا يجوز مررت أخاك وأنت تريد بأخيك فإن قال لا يجوز حذف الباء من هذا قيل له فهذا لا يقال أيضا

---

[51] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 59, Derenbourg 1, 126/Hārūn 1, 300.

[52] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 54, Derenbourg 1, 117/Hārūn 1, 275–7, and see §4 below. The notion of *tamṯīl* is stated explicitly in the beginning of chapter 54 (dealing with warning exclamations in the sense of "beware!", Derenbourg 1, 116/Hārūn 1, 273): إلا أنّ هذا لا يجوز فيه إظهار ما أضمرت ولكن ذكرته لأمثّل لك ما لا يُظهر إضماره "Except that [in] this [construction], making apparent [i.e. uttering] that which you concealed is impermissible but I mention it [to you] to bring to your senses the [component] whose concealment is not apparent [uttered]".

[53] Such as كلّمته فاهُ إلى فيَّ lit. "I spoke to him, his mouth[-dependent] to mine" i.e. "I spoke to him face-to-face"; Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 92, Derenbourg 1, 167/Hārūn 1, 391.

> al-Ḫalīl claims that their saying "I got a profit of one dirham[-indefinite, dependent] on every dirham[-definite, dependant]" is nonsense,[54] unless you say *fī l-dirhami* or *li-l-dirhami* [i.e. utter the prepositions *fī* or *li-* before the definite *dirham*]. Likewise we have found the Bedouins say: Were someone to say, *Omit the preposition and cast it aside* [i.e. say: *rabiḥtu l-dirhama dirhaman*], he would be replied, *It is not permissible to do that* [*omit the preposition*] *just as saying "I passed your brother" and meaning "by your brother" is impermissible*. If [the first] says [i.e. concedes], *Omitting the* [*preposition*] *bi- from here* [*marartu aḫāka*] *is impermissible*, then he is replied, *Then this* [*rabiḥtu l-dirhama dirhaman*] *is not said either*.[55]

The fact that the tag *muḥāl* is applied to "their speech" (قولهم) may reflect a more prescriptive approach to natural sentences on the part of al-Ḫalīl; similarly, the highly developed debate that Sībawayhi records may reflect an internal dialogue among Bedouin circles regarding the (prescriptive) 'correctness' of certain sentences that *existed* in their language. Sībawayhi's silence on the issue is suggestive of his differing approach, that is to say, his descriptivism toward attested Bedouin speech.[56]

3. *Muḥāl*-Marked Sentences Used as a Pedagogical Tool

The 'explanatory' function of *muḥāl*-marked sentences serves as a pedagogical tool to describe to the learner the rules of the language, or rather, the rules that Sībawayhi and his colleagues have defined. One example can be found within the chapter titled ما ينتصب لأنه خبر للمعروف "That which is assigned the *naṣb* because it [gives] information on a known [entity]", as in the archetype هذا عبدُالله منطلقًا "there is 'Abdullāhi leaving".[57] Here Sībawayhi sets out to explain why sentences like هو زيدٌ معروفًا "that is Zayd, no doubt" or هو زيدٌ فاخرًا "that is Zayd [in his] boasting[-self]", opening with the independent pronoun, are grammatical but هو زيدٌ منطلقًا is not. Although both هذا عبدُالله منطلقًا and هو زيدٌ معروفًا belong to the same syntactic construction, the intention of the former (opening with the demonstrative) is *not* to identify 'Abdullāhi but to inform about his departure,

54 I refrain from translating *muḥāl* here as 'ungrammatical' as this rendering reflects Sībawayhi's use of the term, not al-Ḫalīl's.

55 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 92, Derenbourg 1, 167/Hārūn 1, 395 [and see n. 1]. I follow Hārūn's reading. See also Jahn, *Sībawaihi's Buch* 1, 248.

56 The controversy surrounding ربحت الدرهم درهما accentuates once again the propinquity of *muḥāl* and *lā yajūzu*. For a less clear-cut instance of *muḥāl* used as a tag on a (perhaps) natural sentence, see n. 45.

57 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 117, Derenbourg 1, 218–9/Hārūn 2, 77–81.

whereas the intention of the latter *is* to identity of Zayd or an aspect thereof.[58] It is in *this* context that Sībawayhi says that uttering the sentence أنا عبدُاللهِ منطلقًا "I am ʿAbdullāhi leaving" or هو زيدٌ منطلقًا "he is Zayd leaving" (opening with the pronoun) to notify someone who knows you or Zayd well about the departure would be *muḥāl*, or ungrammatical, because uttering the pronoun (أنا, هو) makes uttering the referent's name redundant.[59] The point at hand, however, is that in the case of هو زيدٌ معروفًا\فاخرًا an aspect of Zayd's identity is being highlighted or clarified, hence its grammaticality, whereas the fact that one is leaving does not clarify (يُوضح, يعرّف, يؤكّد) an aspect of one's identity.[60] It is due to Sībawayhi's tendency to exhaust all possibilities that he discerns the following 'inconsistency':

هو زيدٌ معروفًا \ فاخرًا ← admissible
*هو زيدٌ منطلقًا ← inadmissible

The inconsistency lies between the admissibility of one sentence and the inadmissibility of another, which—*formally*—seems to belong to the same construction. The inadmissible sentences are of interest to Sībawayhi only inasmuch as they clarify the admissibility of sentences in the construction ما ينتصب لأنه خبر للمعروف opening with a pronoun. We should note that the option of هو زيدٌ منطلقًا is tagged *ġayr jāʾiz* 'impermissible' a few lines earlier: once again, highlighting the equivalence between the two terms, *muḥāl* and *ġayr jāʾiz*.[61]

58 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 218–9/Hārūn 2, 77–81. For the meaning of معروفًا "well-known" as "no doubt" (ومعنى قوله معروفًا لا شكّ) see Derenbourg 1, 219/ Hārūn 2, 79. In the case of فاخرًا "boasting", the idea is to highlight a trait in Zayd that the listener may be unaware of, or it could be a way to belittle Zayd or to praise or threaten him, depending on the adjective uttered (Derenbourg 1, 218–9/Hārūn 2, 78–80; cf. al-Sīrāfī's explanation stated in Hārūn 2, 79 n.1). In these cases the dependent constituent (seen as a *ḥāl* 'circumstantial qualifier') is taken as an explanatory component (*tafsīr*).

59 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 219/Hārūn 2, 80–1.

60 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 218/Hārūn 2, 78–80.

61 فلو ذكر هنا الانطلاق كان غير جائز (Derenbourg 1, 219/Hārūn 2, 79). It should be noted that Sībawayhi does provide a context in which أنا عبدُاللهِ منطلقًا is admissible (Derenbourg 1, 219/Hārūn 2, 81), meaning in and of itself, the sentence is not ungrammatical: this is if the listener is located behind a wall or somewhere the speaker is unaware of, in which case uttering a sentence like "It's me Zayd coming to your aid" (أنا زيدٌ منطلقًا في حاجتك) would be "fine" (*ḥasan*; note the contrast with *muḥāl*). This example is cited by Baalbaki (*Legacy*, 202) to illustrate the importance of Context in Sībawayhi's grammatical analysis. The *naḥwiyyūn* seem to have accepted هو زيدٌ منطلقًا regardless of context (Derenbourg 1, 219/Hārūn 2, 80; compare R. Talmon, "*Naḥwiyyūn* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*," *Zeitschrift für*

A statement that could support the view that Sībawayhi's intent here is pedagogical is the following (quoted above for the *muḥāl-ḥasan* juxtaposition): وإنّما ذكر الخليل هذا لتَعرِف ما يُحال منه وما يَحسُن "al-Ḫalīl mentioned this [the explanation regarding هو زيدٌ معروفاً] only in order for you to know/distinguish what is ungrammatical of [this construction] from what is grammatical".[62] In other words, the reader may not "know" the limits and workings of the construction at hand and thus may not recognize the ungrammatical sentence as such. We shall find a similar remark below.

The next example exhibits another so-called inconsistency, this time between the verb's *form*, or tense, and the intended *time reference*. This example could potentially shed some light on the archetypal أتيتك غدا* and سآتيك أمس*, as it seems to be the question of *tense* that stands at the basis of these ungrammatical sentences. Interestingly, this is the only *muḥāl* instance that is comparable to the archetypal *muḥāl* sentences.

The discussion in point concerns the various conjugations of the construction ما عَدَوْتَ أن فعلتَ "you inevitably did [so and so], you did not delay/fail to do [so and so]".[63] The key statement here is ويجوز أن يُجعل أَفْعَلَ في موضع فعلتُ ولا يجوز فعلتُ في موضع أفعل "The imperfect [after the particle *ʾan*] can be placed in the position of the perfect [i.e. still keeping with the past time reference], but the perfect cannot be placed in the position of the imperfect [i.e. still keeping with the future time reference]".[64] Thus ماعدوت

---

arabische Linguistik 8 [1982]: 23). We find another instance of *muḥāl* in this context, but here it is probably in the non-technical sense: "It is impossible/absurd for the noun to appear after it [the pronoun] when you give information about an action-like or a non-action-like attribute [. . .]" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 117, Derenbourg 1, 219/Hārūn 2, 80). Alternatively, one could understand it as "Uttering [making apparent] the noun after the pronoun [. . .] is ungrammatical", in which case the sense of *muḥāl* would be 'technical'. It is cases like this which I referred to above as 'a gray area' (n. 37).

62 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 219/Hārūn 2, 80.

63 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 244, Derenbourg 1, 383/Hārūn 3, 55–6 (henceforth: the *mā ʿadawta ʾan faʿalta*-construction). This construction is discussed as a side-note to the chapter dealing with two verbs separated by a conjunction following the particle *ʾan*; *viz.* the distinction between أريد أن تأتيَني ثم تحدّثَني (where the second verb 'shares' the mood marker with the first) "I want you to visit[-dependent] me and then talk[-dependent] with me" and أريد أن تأتيَني ثم تحدّثُني "I want you to visit[-dependent] me, then you will talk[-independent] with me" (chapter 244, Derenbourg 1, 382/Hārūn 3, 52).

64 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 383/Hārūn 3, 55 (a similar remark is given in chapter 239, Derenbourg 1, 370/Hārūn 3, 24). Sībawayhi adds that the only exception to this rule is the conditional mood (*mujāzāt*), as in إنْ فعلتَ فعلتُ "If you do, I will do", which displays a future time reference despite the perfect form of the verb (chapter 244, Derenbourg 1, 383/Hārūn 3, 55). More on the "lack of correspondence" between tense-forms and time-reference-meanings can be found in Owens, *Foundations*, 234–5 (Sībawayhi is not mentioned). One

أن أجالسك can express either a past or a future time reference "I inevitably [-perfect] sat in your company/will sit in your company[-imperfect]", but it is inferred that ما عدوت أن جالستك can only refer to the past (I keep to the verb جالس "to sit in one's company" above for the purpose of uniformity; see next excerpt):

> وتقول ما عدوت أن آتِيَك أي ما عدوت أن يكون هذا من رأيي فيما أَستقبلُ [sic.] ويجوز أن يُجعل أَفْعَلَ [sic.] في موضع فعلتُ ولا يجوز فعلت في موضع أفعل

> When you say *I am not failing*[-perfect] *to visit you*[-imperfect] you mean *inevitably this will happen according to what I expect will occur* [i.e. time reference = future], and the imperfect [*ātiyaka*] can be placed in the position of the perfect [i.e. *mā ʿadawtu ʾan ātiyaka* = *mā ʿadawtu ʾan ataytuka* = past time reference] but the perfect [*ataytuka*] cannot be placed in the position of the imperfect [i.e. *mā ʿadawtu ʾan ataytuka* in the 'future' sense is inadmissible].[65]

It is because Sībawayhi identifies a double sense in ما عدوت أن آتيك that he moves on to 'experiment' with ما أعدو أن جالستك and ما أعدو أن أجالسك (عدا-imperfect). Here, however, the former can only refer to the past and the latter can only refer to the future:

> وتقول والله ما أعدو أن جالستك أي أن كنت فعلت ذلك أي ما أجاوز مجالستك فيما مضى ولو أراد ما أعدو أن جالستك غداً كان محالا ونقضا كما أنه لو قال ما أعدو أن أجالسك أمس كان محالا

> You say: *By God I did not fail*[-imperfect] *to sit in your company*[-perfect], meaning *I had done that*, i.e. *I am not overlooking my sitting in your company in the past*; and if he means *It is inevitable that I sat in your company*[-perfect] *tomorrow* [i.e. in the sense of 'future'], it is ungrammatical and a contradiction, just as if he were to say *It is inevitable that I sit in your company*[-imperfect] *yesterday* [i.e. in the sense of 'past'], it is ungrammatical.[66]

The sole purpose of expressing the adverbials أمس "yesterday" and غدا "tomorrow" here (or فيما مضى "before/in the past" and فيما أستقبل "that which I anticipate [to come]") is to signal the time reference; *viz.* the sense of

---

tenth century grammarian uses specific technical terms to refer to perfect/imperfect verbs that express the 'opposing' time reference; see R. Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar Morphological Terminology from the Early Fourth Century A.H.: Mu'addib's *Daqāʾiq al-Taṣrīf*," in *Grammar as a Window onto Arabic Humanism: A Collection of Articles in Honour of Michael G. Carter*, eds. L. Edzard and J. Watson (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006), 24–6.

65 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 244, Derenbourg 1, 383/Hārūn 3, 55.

66 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 383/Hārūn 3, 55.

past and future, respectively.[67] Once again, adducing the ungrammatical sentences has to do with exhausting all possibilities in the construction, especially as one encounters a single time reference being expressed by two different verb forms (ما عدوت أن أُجالسك = ما عدوت أن جالستك [past]) and conversely, two time references being expressed by one and the same verb form (ما عدوت أن أجالسك [either past or future]).[68] We may summarize the conjugations that Sībawayhi exhausts in the following table:[69]

(imperfect) عدا—يفعل	(perfect) عدا—فعل
grammatical ← (F) ما أعدو أن أجالسك (تقول)	grammatical ← (F) ما عدوت أن أجالسك (تقول)
ungrammatical ← (P) *ما أعدو أن أجالسك (محال)	grammatical ← (P) ما عدوت أن أجالسك (يجوز)
grammatical ← (P) ما أعدو أن جالستك (تقول)	grammatical ← (P) ما عدوت أن جالستك (تقول)
ungrammatical ← (F) *ما أعدو أن جالستك (محال)	ungrammatical ← (F) *ما عدوت أن جالستك (لا يجوز)

That Sībawayhi's purpose here is pedagogical is evident from his concluding remark: وإنّما ذكرت هذا لتصرف وجوهه ومعانيه وأن لا تستحيل منه مستقيما فإنه كلام يستعمله الناس "I am only mentioning this [to you] because of its [the *mā ʿadawta ʾan faʿalta*–construction] versatile ways and meanings and lest you find some grammatical [form] of it ungrammatical, for it is a con-

[67] For the use of غداً as a "non-terminological reference to the future tense" in al-Ḫalīl's *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*, see R. Talmon, *Arabic Grammar in its Formative Age: Kitāb al-ʿAyn and its Attribution to al-Ḫalīl b. Aḥmad* (Leiden, New York: Brill, 1997), 155 (under the sub-heading 'Tenses').

[68] Cf. the chapter in the *Risāla* titled باب اللفظ للمعاني ~"Wording vis-à-vis meaning" dealing with synonymy and homonymy; Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 4, Derenbourg 1, 6–7/ Hārūn 1, 24 (his examples are limited to single words, but by extension synonymy and homonymy can reside on the sentence-level, as in the case above).

[69] Key: P=past time reference; F=future time reference. I specify in parentheses the expression used by Sībawayhi to mark the sentence; if Sībawayhi precedes the sentence with تقول "you say", we take it as a 'marker' of grammaticality. I am keeping with the verb جالس for the sake of uniformity. The 'unmarked' forms with which Sībawayhi opens the discussion are ما عدوت أن فعلت and لا [ما] أعدو أن أفعل. It is inferred that the former has a past time reference and that the latter has a future time reference.

struction that people use"[70] (cf. above, وإنّما ذكر الخليل هذا لتعرف ما يحال منه وما يحسن). In other words, due to the "versatile" behaviour of the construction at hand, the reader may not identify the ungrammatical sentences as such; indeed, he may not at all be aware of the significations of the construction's various forms.

Another example that we may characterize as pedagogically-oriented has not to do with correct use of tense but with correct use of mood. It is discussed under the chapter dealing with the particle حتّى "until; so that; such that; even" involving two agents; i.e. cases in which the agent of the verb preceding حتّى differs from the agent of the verb following it.[71] After presenting the properties of this construction, Sībawayhi disallows (لا يجوز, محال) the independent تطلعُ in *سرت حتّى أدخلُها وتطلعُ الشمس ~"I travelled such that I entered[-independent] it and that the sun would rise[-independent]" on account of that fact that "your travelling does not cause the sun's rising".[72] Conversely, the dependent تطلعَ in *سرت حتى أدخلُها وتطلعَ الشمس ~"I travelled such that I entered[-independent] it and the sun rose[-dependent]" is also disallowed (محال) "unless you assign the dependent mood [*naṣb*] to the verb preceding the conjunction [i.e. أدخلَها]", for the presence of the conjunction demands that both verbs share the same mood marker.[73] The only acceptable (يَحسُن) form would be to utter an additional حتّى: سرت حتى تطلعَ الشمس وحتى أدخلُها "I travelled until the sun rose[-dependent] and such that I entered[-independent] it".[74]

As in the previous *muḥāl* examples, here too one might assume that the reader is not necessarily familiar with the workings of the grammatical construction at hand and may not recognize the sentences as ungrammatical. What is more revealing about this case, however, is that the first

---

70 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 244, Derenbourg 1, 383–4/Hārūn 3, 56.

71 ما يكون العمل فيه من اثنين "that in which the action is [carried out] by two [agents]"; Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 240, Derenbourg 1, 371/Hārūn 3, 25.

72 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 372/Hārūn 3, 26–7. This complies with the previously defined rule regarding this construction (حتّى involving two agents), according to which the independent mood (*rafʿ*) in the verb following حتّى implies that the agent of that verb is the cause (سبب, يؤدّيه) for the action expressed in the verb preceding حتّى (Derenbourg 1, 371/Hārūn 3, 25). This construction has bearings on the *Ḥijāzī* reading of Q 2.214 وزُلزِلوا حتّى يقولُ الرسول "They were shaken so that the Prophet would say[-independent]" (rather than حتّى يقولَ "until the Prophet said[-dependent]"). Constructions that deal with the verbal mood following حتّى—not involving two agents—are treated in this volume by Arik Sadan.

73 Sībawayhi *Kitāb* chapter 240, Derenbourg 1, 372/Hārūn 3, 26–7.

74 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 372/Hārūn 3, 27.

disallowed sentence, explained in pure semantic (or logical) terms, is tagged primarily as *lā yajūzu* (in addition to *muḥāl*), whereas the second disallowed sentence, explained in pure 'formal' terms (*rafʿ-naṣb* discrepancy between the two verbs) is tagged solely as *muḥāl*. This would support the hypothesis put forth in this paper, according to which Sībawayhi's *iḥāla* refers primarily to syntactic ungrammaticality (however multi-faceted).

To recapitulate this section: when Sībawayhi adduces a *muḥāl*-marked sentence to fulfil an explanatory and descriptive function, i.e. for pedagogical purposes, he usually does so out of a highly systematic tendency to exhaust all linguistic possibilities pertaining to the grammatical construction at hand. The following table may be given as one last example that neatly reflects this tendency (the sentences are discussed under the chapter dealing with multiple adjectives, here *badal* 'substitution', sharing the same case):[75]

	Sentence	Structural Properties
1	ما مررت برجلٍ صالحٍ بل طالحٍ → grammatical "I did not pass by a good person but by a corrupt one"	sentence is *negative*
2	مررت برجلٍ صالحٍ بل طالحٍ → grammatical "I passed by a good, rather, a corrupt person"	sentence is *affirmative*
3	ما مررت برجلٍ صالحٍ ولكن طالحٍ → grammatical "I did not pass by a good person but by a corrupt one"	sentence is *negative*
4	*مررت برجلٍ صالحٍ ولكن طالحٍ → ungrammatical (*muḥāl*) *"I passed by a good person but a corrupt one"	*sentence is *affirmative*

It is because both an affirmative and a negative sentence are adduced in the case of بل "but; rather" that Sībawayhi exhausts the affirmative and

[75] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 101, Derenbourg 1, 178/Hārūn 1, 421 ff. The table is extracted from chapter 101, Derenbourg 1, 184/Hārūn 1, 434–5; emphases are mine. In all four sentences the second adjective is the *badal* sharing its case with the first adjective. The ungrammatical sentence (#4) is discussed in more detail—albeit in isolation from the context in which it is adduced—in Carter, "An Arab Grammarian," 149. In sentence #2 the speaker retracts his words out of forgetfulness (على النسيان) or error (على الغلط); the second adjective is nevertheless a *badal*.

the negative options with regards to ولكن "but". The tendency to present 'linguistic behaviours' in *patterns* is strongly associated, to my mind, with pedagogical methodology.[76]

4. *Muḥāl*-Marked Sentences Used as a Theoretical Tool (*Dalīl*)

A separate function that a *muḥāl*-marked sentence may fulfil is to provide evidence or proof (دليل) for a grammatical rule that is defined by the grammarian (in the 'classic' cases we will find the stem د.ل.ل "to indicate, to prove" in Sībawayhi's discussion, but it need not appear explicitly). This type of proof forms part of the *theoretical*, or *scientific* apparatus of the *Kitāb* albeit its pedagogical import should not be ignored. When adducing a *muḥāl*-marked sentence as proof, the reader must recognize it as inadmissible; indeed, Sībawayhi counts on this recognition, or judgment, in order for the proof to be effective. For the purpose of our discussion, we may refer to this identification on the part of the reader as a type of 'grammaticality judgment'.[77]

Our first example concerns the understanding of the particle لِ "for; to; so that" in the archetypal جئتك لتفعلَ "I came to you so that you would do [-dependent] [such and such]" *not* as the causer of the dependent mood in the imperfect verb. According to Sībawayhi, the mood marker is the result of an implied أنْ, and had we not understood جئتك لتفعلَ with an implied أن, the sentence would be ungrammatical (*muḥāl*) as it would amount to uttering a verb after a preposition, the latter being the basic function of لِ. The reason for this stems from the previously defined rule according to which particles like لِ and حتّى can only exert effect on nouns, not

---

[76] Other cases which I would classify as fulfilling the pedagogical function are Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 103, Derenbourg 1, 186/Hārūn 1, 439; chapter 141, Derenbourg 1, 255 (ll. 15–21)/Hārūn 2, 169; chapter 145, Derenbourg 1, 259/Hārūn 2, 177; chapter 224, Derenbourg 1, 353 (ll. 12–21)/Hārūn 2, 405–6; chapter 241, Derenbourg 1, 372–3/Hārūn 3, 28 (if one interprets *istaḥāla* in the technical sense); chapter 254, Derenbourg 1, 403/Hārūn 3, 102–3; chapter 270, Derenbourg 1, 420/Hārūn 3, 143–4.

[77] It should be made clear that as opposed to the modern understanding of 'grammaticality judgments', here it is Sībawayhi who is making the judgment and counting on the reader to corroborate it. We find a striking (coincidental) parallelism to Sībawayhi's method of proof using a *muḥāl*-marked sentence in al-Fārābī's (d. 339/950) *al-Alfāẓ al-mustaʿmala fī al-manṭiq*, his introductory work to logic. Termed قول باطل "invalid statement", al-Fārābī's ungrammatical sentence is adduced in order to *prove* certain semantic properties of philosophically-loaded particles such as ما "what"; see Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī, *al-Alfāẓ al-mustaʿmala fī al-manṭiq*, ed. M. Mahdī (Beirut: Dār al-Mašriq, 1986), 48–53.

verbs: ولو لم تضمرها لَكان الكلام محالا لأن اللام وحتّى إنما تعملان في الأسماء "had you not understood an implicit [ʾan] the utterance would have been ungrammatical because *li-* and *ḥattā* exert [grammatical] effect only on nouns".[78] Of course, another approach would simply be to grant لِ the power of *ʿamal* 'grammatical effect' when it comes to verbs as well, but that would go against the defined rule.[79] In fact, were someone to understand لِ in this manner as the cause for the dependent mood, the sentence uttered, جئتك لتفعلَ, would still be grammatical! In other words, Sībawayhi is using the term *muḥāl* here as a tool for indoctrination, so to speak.

This method of justification (and for that matter, the previous method of description and explanation) need not be limited to ungrammatical sentences marked as *muḥāl*. The next example exhibits an explicit use of the stem د.ل.ل but with respect to an ungrammatical sentence tagged *lā yajūzu* (and only later as *muḥāl*). The ungrammatical *رُبَّ رجلٍ وزيدٍ "many a person and Zayd(-definite)" is adduced as *proof* to the indefiniteness of وأخيه "and his brother" in رُبَّ رجلٍ وأخيه "many a person and his brother", where أخيه has the definite *form* of the *iḍāfa* 'annexation'.[80] Adducing a clearly definite noun like Zayd annuls the possibility of understanding أخيه as definite: ويدلُّك على أنّها نكرة أنّه لا يجوز لك أن تقول رُبَّ رجلٍ وزيدٍ "That which proves to you that it [*aḫīhi*] is indefinite [in this construction] is that you cannot say **Many a person and Zayd*".[81] It is a few lines later that Sībawayhi states that uttering أخيه while intending a specific, or identifiable[82] referent (شيء بعينه) would be *muḥāl*, or ungrammatical. But the reiteration of the ungrammatical sense of "many a person and his brother"—this time marked *muḥāl*—only comes as a concluding remark that reaffirms the principle stated earlier regarding the indefinite expression that 'looks' definite in the construction at hand.[83]

---

78 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 234, Derenbourg 1, 362/Hārūn 3, 6.

79 For an elaborate discussion on this issue see Baalbaki, *Legacy*, 76–7, 138–9. Baalbaki too states that "the most obvious alternative of this interpretation would be to ascribe the subjunctive" to particles like لِ (p. 139).

80 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 112, Derenbourg 1, 209/Hārūn 2, 55.

81 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 209/Hārūn 2, 55.

82 The term 'identifiability' is adopted from Lyons and Lambrecht by Marogy (*Kitāb Sībawayhi*, 95–123).

83 This principle is restated after adducing the saying of "one of the Bedouins", كلُّ شاةٍ وسخلَتِها "every ewe and its lamb[-*iḍāfa*]" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 112, Derenbourg 1, 209/Hārūn 2, 55).

One of the more famous examples of a *muḥāl* occurrence is replying "no" to the disjunctive question "Is Zayd at your place or Bišr?".[84] Admittedly, Sībawayhi's point here is not to explain why answering "no" to a disjunctive question yields no communicative meaning (which indeed it does not); his point is to *prove* that the particle أم "or" has the sense of an alternative conjunction and is equivalent to أيُّهم or أيُّهما "which one of them/which of the two". It is in *this* context that Sībawayhi asserts,

> والدليل على أنّ قولك أزيدٌ عندك أم عمروٌ بمنزلة قولك أيُّهما عندك أنك لو قلت أزيدٌ عندك أم بشرٌ فقال المسؤول لا كان محالا كما أنه إذا قال أيُّهما عندك فقال لا فقد أحال
>
> The proof that your saying *Is Zayd at your place or* [*am*] *Bišr* is equivalent to [lit. has the status of] *Which of the two is at your place* is that had you said *Is Zayd at your place or Bišr* and the one being asked had answered *No*, it would have been ungrammatical just as had he said *Which one of the two is at your place* and the [one being asked] had said *No*, he would have uttered an ungrammatical sentence.[85]

Making the point that أم has the sense of an alternative conjunction is important for the following chapter that deals with the 'non-alternative' sense of أم (termed *munqaṭiʿa* 'disconnective'), an issue pertinent to Sībawayhi's analysis of certain Qurʾānic verses.[86] Interestingly, here too Sībawayhi sets out to prove status of أم, and he does so by adducing both (a) an ungrammatical sentence tagged by the *muḥāl*-corresponding لم يستقم "unsound, incorrect, ungrammatical" (based on the same 'grammaticality test' Sībawayhi preformed on the 'alternative' أم), and (b) a *grammatical* sentence that exhibits the disconnective sense of أم in an unambiguous manner:

> هذا باب أَمْ منقطعةً وذلك قولك أعمروٌ عندك أم عندك زيدٌ فهو ليس بمنزلة أيُّهما عندك ألا ترى أنك لو قلت أيُّهما عندك عندك لم يستقم إلا على التكرير والتوكيد ويدلّك على أنّ هذا الآخِر منقطع من الأول قول الرجل إنّها الإبلُ أم شاءٌ يا قومِ

---

[84] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 278, Derenbourg 1, 432/Hārūn 3, 169; Carter, "An Arab Grammarian," 149; *idem*, "Pragmatics and Contractual Language in Early Arabic Grammar and Legal Theory," in *Approaches to Arabic Linguistics: Presented to Kees Versteegh on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, eds. E. Ditters and H. Motzki (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2007), 29.

[85] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 278, Derenbourg 1, 432/Hārūn 3, 169.

[86] E.g. Q 32.3 أَمْ يقولون ٱفْتَرَاهُ "[The sending down of the book wherein no doubt is from the Lord of the worlds] Or/and yet they say *He has invented it*". See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 279, Derenbourg 1, 433/Hārūn 3, 171 ff.

> This is the chapter on *am* [when it is] disconnected [from the preceding words]. That is your saying *Is ʿAmr at your place or rather is Zayd at your place* [exhibiting two independent *ʿindaka*] and it is not equivalent to *Which of the two is at your place*; don't you see that had you said **ayyuhumā ʿindaka ʿindaka* [based on the 'grammaticality test' of the preceding chapter] it would not have been grammatical unless [it was] by way of repetition and emphasis. That which proves to you that this last [*am*] is disconnected from the beginning is the person's saying *They are camels, rather sheep O my kin*.[87]

One might quibble over the strength of his *lam yastaqim*–example, but the adducing of a grammatical utterance exhibiting أم in a declarative sentence (rather than an interrogative one) indeed strengthens his point regarding its disconnective character. What matters for our purposes is that Sībawayhi (very much like modern linguists) realizes the effectiveness grammaticality judgments have in scientific theory and utilizes them to the full.[88]

Our next example concerns the protasis of a conditional sentence that contains two verbs separated by a conjunction (like ثُمَّ "then", وَ "and", فَ "and; then").[89] Sībawayhi discusses this construction vis-à-vis the protasis that contains two verbs *not* separated by a conjunction.[90] The theory Sībawayhi sets out to prove is that when the two verbs are separated by a conjunction, the second verb must 'share' its mood with the first and thus be assigned the apocopate (*jazm*) rather than the independent mood. Thus: إن تأتني وتسألْني أُعطك "If you come to me[-apocopate] and ask me[-apocopate], I will give you [-apocopate]", and not إن تأتني وتسألُني أعطك* "If you come to me and ask me[-independent], I will give you".[91] Sībawayhi proves his case (even though the stem د.ل.ل is absent) by stating that if one were to say متى تأته وعاشيًا* "whenever you come to him and coming at dark", the sequence would be *muḥāl*.[92] In order to understand this 'proof',

---

[87] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 433/Hārūn 3, 172 (note the slightly alternative reading in Hārūn).

[88] Sībawayhi's method of adducing *grammatical* sentences as proof (in addition to ungrammatical ones) could well occupy a separate paper; we shall therefore limit ourselves to the brief remarks above.

[89] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 253, Derenbourg 1, 396–7/Hārūn 3, 87–8.

[90] The chapter is titled ما يرتفع بين الجزمين وينجزم بينهما "that [verb] which is assigned the independent mood between two apocopate [verbs; i.e. between the verb in the protasis and that in the apodosis] and that which is assigned the apocopate between the two"; Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 253, Derenbourg 1, 395/Hārūn 3, 85.

[91] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 396–7/Hārūn 3, 87–8.

[92] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 397/Hārūn 3, 88.

we must look at the beginning of the chapter where إن تأتني تسألُني "if you come to me asking me[-independent verb; no conjunction]" is equated with إن تأتني سائلاً "if you come to me asking[-active participle]" exhibiting a clear case of *ḥāl* 'circumstantial qualifier'. This 'equation' is conveyed by the expressions أردت أن تقول "you intended/meant to say", في موضع "in the place/function of [...]" and كأنه قال "as if he said".[93] The same equation is made in the case of متى تأته تعشو "whenever you come to him at dark [-independent]", taken from a line by the poet al-Ḥuṭayʾa (d. after 41/661).[94] We may demonstrate the 'process' of proof in the following stages:

1. Stage #1: equating verb[-independent mood] with participle
   متى تأته تعشو = متى تأته عاشيًا
2. Stage #2: adding conjunction to the new sentence exhibiting participle
   *متى تأته وعاشيًا → *muḥāl* (the reader instinctively identifies it as ungrammatical)
3. Stage #3 (not stated explicitly): going back from participle to independent verb
   *متى تأته وتعشو → ungrammatical
4. Stage #4 (conclusion; not stated explicitly): the verb must be in the apocopate form
   متى تأته وتعشُ → grammatical

Since Sībawayhi sees the independent verb as fulfilling the 'place', or function of (what we may call) *ḥāl*,[95] he adduces the 'unmarked' *ḥāl* equivalent in the form of the participle (سائلاً, عاشيًا) in order to make his point, just as he adduced the more 'pronounced' definite noun "Zayd", instead of the seemingly definite أخيه "his brother" (see above). Sībawayhi resorts to the most obvious (or least 'marked') case in order to be sure that the

93 I am using the term *ḥāl* here for the sake of simplicity. Sībawayhi does not refer to the dependent active participle here by the term *ḥāl*; all he does is say that the meaning of the sentence with the independent verb is that of the sentence with the participle, or that they occupy the same place/function. For أردت أن تقول see Derenbourg 1, 396/Hārūn 3, 85; for في موضع and كأنه قال see Derenbourg 1, 397/Hārūn 3, 88.

94 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 395–6, 397/Hārūn 3, 85–6, 88. The full poetic line is (in the *ṭawīl* meter): متى تأته تعشو إلى ضوء ناره \\ تجدْ خيرَ نارٍ عندها خيرُ مُوقِدِ "whenever you [as a nightly guest] come to him at dark seeking light from his fire [because of his generosity], you will find that the best fire in it is the best kindler [of the fire; i.e. the praised one]" (see Hārūn 3, 86, n. 2 and Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* 4, 2960 on the meaning of عشا إلى النار).

95 Once again, Sībawayhi does not use the term *ḥāl* in the discussion; see n. 93.

reader identifies his hypothetical sentence as ungrammatical; otherwise, his proof is ineffective.

We shall devote the rest of the section to additional examples of the method of justification and proof through the use of *muḥāl*-marked sentences. For the sake of brevity, I will summarize the 'theory' in question, followed by the 'proof'. Some of the arguments are circular, others may be less convincing; they are nevertheless based on the assumption that one's recognition of an ungrammatical sentence can play an important—and intuitive—role in the process of persuasion.[96]

Theory: The ending كَ (second person suffix) in رويدك "slowly, take it easy" can, in certain contexts, be a mark of emphasis and *not* a personal pronoun. *Proof*: If it were a personal pronoun (i.e. an *ism* 'noun'), the utterance النجاءَك "make [your] escape" would have been *muḥāl*, as the first term of the *iḍāfa* cannot contain the definite article.[97]

Theory: When the particle إلا "except" follows a word belonging to the category of words that can take a suffixed object pronoun (such as verbs or إنَّ "indeed" and its 'sisters'), the independent object pronoun must be used and it cannot be suffixed: ما رأيت إلا إيّاك "I did not see [anyone] but you". *Proof*: the exceptive particle إلا does not pass the "postposing test" (تأخير) that applies to constituents like adverbials or the subject of the sentence, i.e. postposing the component that comes between the verb/إنّ and the independent إيّا (Sībawayhi seems to be positing it as a 'historical' process): إنّ فيها إيّاك → (after postposing) إنّ إياك فيها → إنّك فيها "indeed you are there/in it"; ضرب زيد إيّاه → (after postposing) ضرب إيّاه زيد → ضربه زيد "Zayd hit him". Conversely, if one were to postpose إلا in ما رأيت إلا إيّاك, the sequence (*kalām*) would be *muḥāl* (i.e. ما رأيتك إلا*).[98]

Theory: When relative pronouns like مَنْ "whoever" and ما "whatever" are preceded by إنَّ "indeed" or كان "was", they lose their conditional character; *viz.* إنّ من يأتيني آتيه "Indeed whoever comes[-independent] to me I will

[96] Notice that in several cases the sentence is counterfactually being tagged as *muḥāl*: "Had not P, then X [a *grammatical* sentence] would have been *muḥāl*" (versus the usual "The proof that P is that X [an *ungrammatical* sentence] is *muḥāl*").

[97] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 48, Derenbourg 1, 103–4/Hārūn 1, 244–5. Sībawayhi specifies the contexts in which the كَ suffix *would* have the function of a personal pronoun and the context in which it *would not*.

[98] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 208, Derenbourg 1, 334/Hārūn 2, 361–2. One could take the discussion to mean that the exceptive إلا itself does not belong to the category of words taking a suffixed pronoun, but that would be inconsistent with Sībawayhi's reasoning of why it does not belong there.

come[-independent] to him" rather than إنّ من يأتني آته* exhibiting the apocopate verbs. *Proof*: Uttering إنّ إنْ or إنّ متى lit. "indeed if/whenever" would be *muḥāl* (إن "if" and متى "whenever" exhibit a more 'pronounced' conditional sense than من or ما, just as "Zayd" exhibited a more pronounced sense of definiteness than أخيه; see point made above).[99]

Theory: In sentences like لو كان معنا رجلٌ إلا زيدٌ لَغُلبنا "If any man other than Zayd had been with us, we would have been defeated", إلا acts as an adjective (*waṣf*) equivalent to مثل "as, like" and غير "other than". *Proof*: Had one said (removing the term before إلا) لو كان معنا إلا زيدٌ لَهلكنا "if [anyone] other than Zayd had been with us, we would have perished" and intended the 'exceptive' sense (*istiṯnā'*) of إلا, he would have uttered an ungrammatical sentence (*aḥalta*).[100]

Theory: One cannot utter the implied verb إلزم lit. "take upon yourself" that is understood to be the cause of the dependent mood in warning exclamations like الحَذَرَ الحَذَرَ "be careful" (or to utter عليك "upon yourself" in the case of النَجَاءَ النَجَاءَ "get away, save yourself") because these exclamations have the status of the imperative (بمنزلةِ افْعَلْ). *Proof*: Uttering إلزم* افْعَلْ or عليك افْعَلْ* "(take it) upon yourself do!" is *muḥāl* (i.e. just as إلزم or عليك cannot be uttered before an imperative verb, likewise they cannot be uttered before a warning exclamation).[101]

CONCLUSION: *IḤĀLA VIS-À-VIS NAQḌ*

Looking back at Sībawayhi's quasi-definition of *muḥāl*, namely أن تنقض أول كلامك بآخره "contradicting the beginning of your utterance with its end" (see §1), it is perhaps surprising to find that the collocation of محال and نقض "contradiction" occurs only twice in the *Kitāb* (excluding *bāb al-istiqāma*; these are in fact the only instances of the *maṣdar* 'verbal noun' of the

---

[99] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 247, Derenbourg 1, 390/Hārūn 3, 71–2.

[100] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 194, Derenbourg 1, 322–3/Hārūn 2, 331.

[101] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 54, Derenbourg 1, 117/Hārūn 1, 275–6. For additional examples of ungrammatical sentences adduced as a *dalīl* 'proof' see n. 49. For examples of ungrammatical sentences adduced as a proof but tagged *lam yastaqim/lā yastaqīm* see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 33, Derenbourg 1, 58/Hārūn 1, 138 (notice the word دليل); chapter 33, Derenbourg 1, 59/Hārūn 1, 141 (ألا ترى...‎ "don't you see [...]"); chapter 219, Derenbourg 1, 346/Hārūn 2, 389 (ويدلّك على أنّ...‎); chapter 221, Derenbourg 1, 349–50/Hārūn 2, 397 (وممّا يقوّي "that which strengthens [...]"); chapter 239, Derenbourg 1, 371/Hārūn 3, 24–5 (ألا ترى...‎).

verb نقض in the *Kitāb*).[102] One instance involves incorrect use of tense (in the *mā ʿadawta ʾan faʿalta*–construction) similar to the archetypal *muḥāl* sentences (see relevant quotation and discussion in §3).[103] The second instance involves the noun-like particle كم "how many" in the impermissible (غير جائز) sequence *كم لا رجلاً ولا رجلين lit. "how many not one person [-dependent] nor two[-dependent]", in which uttering the constituent after كم as the "explanation of the number" (تفسير العدد, i.e. the noun being counted) "would be ungrammatical and a contradiction".[104] The wording in both instances, namely كان محالاً و(كان) نقضًا, suggests a difference between the two terms. Indeed, following the occurrences of the verb نقض in the *Kitāb* reveals that it is in fact *this* term that is associated with the logical/semantic dimension of the utterance: the vast majority of occurrences exhibit the term *maʿnā* 'meaning, intention' as the verb's direct object—bringing us directly to the realm of the speaker's intention or the purpose of the utterance.[105] The expression usually occurs in the negation, لم ينَقض معنًى "does not contradict [any] meaning".[106]

---

102 Troupeau, *Lexique*, 205 (I am excluding Derenbourg 1, 9 [l. 12] which has the alternative reading نقص). The verb نقض, on the other hand, appears 27 times besides its occurrence in *bāb al-istiqāma* (Troupeau, *Lexique*, 205; note that Derenbourg 1, 144 [l. 3] should read 145 [l. 3]).

103 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 244, Derenbourg 1, 383 (l. 21)/Hārūn 3, 55.

104 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 141, Derenbourg 1, 255/Hārūn 2, 168. More precisely, the impermissible sentence is adduced in order to explain the sentence كم قد أتاني لا رجلٌ ولا رجلان "How many [people] came to me, not one person[-independent] nor two[-independent]!": here, Sībawayhi says, لا رجلٌ ولا رجلان "not one person nor two" is the modifier (توكيد) of كم (whose predicate is قد أتاني "came to me") and not of the counted noun—hence its independent mood—otherwise the sentence would be ungrammatical and a contradiction. One could classify this case within the *dalīl* function of *muḥāl*-marked sentences.

105 This reflects Carter's understanding of the term *maʿnā* in the *Kitāb* as cited in K. Versteegh, "The Arabic Tradition," in *The Emergence of Semantics in Four Linguistic Traditions*, eds. W. van Bekkum, J. Houben, I. Sluiter and K. Versteegh (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1997), 242–3. Versteegh concedes that *maʿnā* may refer to the "purpose of speech" but states that in most cases, "*maʿnā* denotes the syntactic function of a word or category" (p. 243). This is not the place to open up the question of *maʿnā* in the *Kitāb*, but at least in the case of نَقَضَ المعنى (including نَقَضَ النفي "to contradict the [meaning of] negation", see following note), I think Carter's understanding is appropriate. I would like to thank Almog Kasher for referring me to Versteegh's discussion of *maʿnā* in the *Kitāb*.

106 Other variants include لا ينقض ما تريد "does not contradict what you intend/mean" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 196, Derenbourg 1, 325/Hārūn 3, 338), لا ينقض الحديث\ما تريد من معنى الحديث "does not contradict the speech/purpose of speech that you intend" (chapter 37, Derenbourg 1, 74/Hārūn 1, 174; chapter 59, Derenbourg 1, 127/Hārūn 1, 303), لم ينقض معنى ما أرادوا لو تكلموا ب... "does not contradict the meaning/purpose that they intended had they uttered …" (chapter 208, Derenbourg 1, 334/Hārūn 2, 361), تنقض ما تكلمت به "you contradict what you uttered" (chapter 75, Derenbourg 1, 151/Hārūn 1, 361). All but three of the

The 'technical' expression *lam yanquḍ maʿnan* (and its like) is typically employed by Sībawayhi in order to justify certain syntactic operations on the grounds that they do not contradict the purpose/intention of the utterance. Conversely, *muḥāl*-marked sentences typically do *not* revolve around the intention of the speaker (though this question is always in the background of Sībawayhi's analyses) but rather around the 'formal' correctness of the sentence. Put differently, if at all a contradiction is implied by *muḥāl*-marked sentences, its basis is formal: adding a preposition to verb, incorrect use of tense (i.e. the *form faʿaltu* vs. the *form afʿalu*), inconsistent case/mood markers (i.e. the *form -u* vs. the *form -a* or ø), indefinite vs. definite words (*vis-à-vis* their *form*), and the like.

In light of the fact that Sībawayhi's *actual* employment of *muḥāl* typically lacks the explicit *naqḍ* dimension, we are once again confronted with the 'extraneousness' of his *bāb al-istiqāma* (cf. the moot *kaḏib*). Carter concedes that many of the notions appearing in the *Risāla* may have been taken from the teachings of the *naḥwiyyūn*.[107] The speech-soundness classification could in fact be one of these notions, especially as we find another predecessor of Sībawayhi treating the issue, namely al-Ḫalīl (as recorded by Ibn Manẓūr, see §1). As I hope this study has shown, the main issue concerning *muḥāl*-marked sentences is not whether their incorrectness lies in a syntactic level or a semantic one, nor whether or not the sentences are nonsensical; in fact, many a time they can quite easily be deciphered by the listener.[108] Rather, the picture that emerges from

---

27 instances of the verb نقض in the *Kitāb* follow this pattern (again, usually exhibiting simply *maʿnā* as the direct object). In two instances (both in chapter 241, Derenbourg 1, 377–8/Hārūn 3, 40) it is a 'type' of *maʿnā* that is being contradicted, namely "negation" (تنقض النفي), or what Versteegh would call a "function of a word or category" (Versteegh, *Semantics*, 242–3). One instance (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 119, Derenbourg 1, 220/Hārūn 2, 83) could be read as a 'non-technical' instance of the verb in that it does not refer to a specimen of language.

107 Carter, "Les Origines," 95, n. 85; restated in Talmon, "*Naḥwiyyūn*," 18.

108 Notable examples of *muḥāl* sentences that could be understood by the listener include: إنّ من يأتني آته* "indeed whoever comes to me I will come to him" (verbs should be in the independent mood, not the apocopate; see §4), إن تأتني وتسألُني أعطك* "if you come to me and ask me I will give you" (second verb should be in the apocopate, not independent; see §4), سرت حتّى أدخلُها وتطلعَ الشمس* "I travelled such that I entered it and [until] the sun rose" (the imperfect verb "to rise" cannot be in the dependent mood but must follow an additional حتّى; see §3), قد قاله القوم حتّى أَنَّ زيداً يقوله* "The people have said it [such that] even Zayd is saying it" (wrong conjunction: should be حتّى إنَّ; see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 270, Derenbourg 1, 420/Hārūn 3, 143–4 and Talmon, "*Kalām*," 89, n.50), or answering عبدين "two slaves" to the question كم عبداً لك "How many slaves[-dependent]

analyzing the *muḥāl* instances shows a deliberate and consistent use of ungrammatical sentences on the part of Sībawayhi for the purposes of pedagogy and/or theory (§3, §4). When pedagogy comes into play, the ungrammatical sentence is adduced as a way of 'mapping out' all linguistic possibilities pertaining to a certain construction, thus making clear the 'limits' of that construction; the reader would not necessarily identify the sequence as ungrammatical. When theory comes into play, the ungrammatical sentence is used as a scientific tool to prove a previously-defined grammatical rule; in order for the proof to be effective, the reader must identify the sequence as ungrammatical.

The term *muḥāl*, which in its original lexical meaning is language-bound and thus intrinsically implies 'speech' (§1), is not the only expression used by Sībawayhi to mark ungrammatical sentences. Other such expressions in the *Kitāb* include لم يستقم "is not sound/correct", لا يجوز\غير جائز "is not permissible", لا تقول "you do not say" and لا يكون كلاماً "is not a [valid] utterance", some of which we came across in this paper.[109] In fact, and pending on further research, it would seem that the only thing distinguishing these ungrammatical sequences from those tagged *muḥāl*—is rhetorical effect.

References

Primary Sources

al-ʿĀmilī, ʿAdī b. al-Riqāʿ. *Dīwān šiʿr ʿadī b. al-riqāʿ al-ʿāmilī*. Edited by Nūrī Ḥammūdī al-Qaysī and Ḥātim Ṣāliḥ al-Ḍāmin. [Baghdad]: Maṭbaʿat al-Majmaʿ al-ʿIlmī al-ʿIrāqī, 1987.

al-ʿAskarī, Abū Hilāl. *al-Furūq fī al-luġa*. Ed. Lajnat Iḥyāʾ al-Turāṯ al-ʿArabī fī Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadīda. Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadīda, 1983.

al-Fārābī, Abū Naṣr. *al-Alfāẓ al-mustaʿmala fī al-manṭiq*. Edited by Muḥsin Mahdī. Beirut: Dār al-Mašriq, 1986.

al-Fārisī, Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad. *Aqsām al-aḫbār*. Edited by ʿAlī Jābir al-Manṣūrī. *al-Mawrid* 7.3 (1978): 201–220.

do you have" (the number in the reply should be in the independent case, i.e. عبدان, not dependent; see chapter 141, Derenbourg 1, 255/Hārūn 2, 169).

[109] For *lā taqūlu*-sentences see e.g. Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 141, Derenbourg 1, 251/Hārūn 2, 158–9 (two instances); chapter 256, Derenbourg 1, 406/Hārūn 3, 110; chapter 269, Derenbourg 1, 419–20/Hārūn 3, 142. For *lā yakūnu kalāman*-sentences see e.g. chapter 2, Derenbourg 1, 2/Hārūn 1, 14; chapter 19, Derenbourg 1, 23/ Hārūn 1, 16 (notice the clear *dalīl* function in both cases. I thank Mohsen Goudarzi for the latter reference) and also Talmon, "*Kalām*," 83. For *lam yastaqim*-sentences see §4 and n. 101. Instances of *lā yajūzu*-sentences have been discussed throughout the paper; notably, the verb جاز in its *negated* form appears 440 times in the *Kitāb* (Troupeau, *Lexique*, 63, though not all instances need be 'tags' referring to sentences).

Ibn Fāris, Aḥmad al-Qazwīnī. *al-Ṣāḥibī fī fiqh al-luġa wa-sunan al-ʿarab fī kalāmihā*. Edited by Moustafa al-Chouémi. Beirut: Mu'assasat Badrān li-l-Ṭibāʿa wa-l-Našr, 1963.
Ibn Manẓūr, Muḥammad b. Mukarram. *Lisān al-ʿarab*. 3rd edition. 6 Vols. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, [n.d.].
al-Ḫalīl b. Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī. *Kitāb al-ʿayn*. Edited by Mahdī al-Maḫzūmī and Ibrāhīm al-Samārrā'ī. 5 Vols. [Baghdad]: al-Jumhūriyya al-ʿIrāqiyya, Wizārat al-Ṯaqāfa wa-l-Iʿlām, Dār al-Rašīd, 1980–1985.
al-Ḫuwārizmī, Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yūsuf al-Kātib. *Kitāb mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm*. Edited by G. van Vloten. Lugduni-Batavorum: Brill, 1895.
al-Jurjānī, ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Sayyid al-Šarīf. *Kitāb al-taʿrīfāt*. Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān, 1969.
Qudāma b. Jaʿfar. *Kitāb naqd al-šiʿr*. Edited by S. A. Bonebakker. Leiden: Brill, 1956.
al-Šantamarī, al-Aʿlam Abū al-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf b. Sulaymān. *al-Nukat fī tafsīr Kitāb Sībawayhi*. Edited by Zuhayr ʿAbd al-Muḥsin Sulṭān. 2 Vols. Kuwait: Maʿhad al-Maḫṭūṭāt al-ʿArabiyya, al-Munaẓamma al-ʿArabiyya li-l-Tarbiya wa-l-Ṯaqāfa wa-l-ʿUlūm, 1987.
Sībawayhi, ʿAmr ibn ʿUṯmān. *Kitāb*, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Edited by H. Derenbourg. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag 1970), (2) edited by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. 5 vols. [Cairo]: Dār al-Qalam, 1966–1977.
al-Sīrāfī, Abū Saʿīd. *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*. Edited by Ramaḍān ʿAbd al-Tawwāb, Maḥmūd Fahmī Ḥijāzī and Muḥammad Hāšim ʿAbd al-Dāyim. 10 vols. [Cairo]: al-Hay'a al-Miṣriyya al-ʿĀmma li-l-Kitāb, 1986.
al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr. *Kitāb al-iqtirāḥ fī ʿilm uṣūl al-naḥw*. Hyderabad: Jamʿiyyat Dā'irat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUṯmāniyya, 1940.
al-Zamaḫšarī, Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar. *Asās al-balāġa*. Edited by Mazyad Nuʿaym and Šawqī al-Maʿarrī. Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān Nāširūn, 1998.

Secondary Sources

Abboud, P.F. "Sībawayhi's Notion of Grammaticality." *al-ʿArabiyya* 12 (1979): 58–67.
Arazi, A. and S. Masalha. *al-ʿIqd al-ṯamīn fī dawāwīn al-šuʿarāʾ al-sitta al-jāhilīn*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Institute of Asian and African Studies, 1999.
Ayoub, G. "De ce qui 'ne se dit pas' dans le Livre de Sībawayhi: La Notion de *Tamṯīl*." In *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*, edited by K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter, 1–15. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1990.
Baalbaki, R. "Unfamiliar Morphological Terminology from the Early Fourth Century A.H.: Mu'addib's *Daqā'iq al-Taṣrīf*." In *Grammar as a Window onto Arabic Humanism: A Collection of Articles in Honour of Michael G. Carter*, edited by L. Edzard and J. Watson, 21–50. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.
——, Introduction to *The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition*, edited by *idem*. Aldershot; Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 2007.
——, *The Legacy of the Kitāb: Sībawayhi's Analytical Methods within the Context of the Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2008.
Bohas, G., J.-P. Guillaume and D.E. Kouloughli. *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*. Forwarded by M.G. Carter. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2006. Originally published: London, New York: Routledge, 1990.
Carter, M.G. "Les Origines de la Grammaire Arabe." *Revues des Études Islamiques* 40 (1972): 69–97. Reprinted as "The Origins of Arabic Grammar." In *The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition*, edited by R. Baalbaki, 1–26. Aldershot, Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 2007.
——, "An Arab Grammarian of the Eighth Century A.D.: A Contribution to the History of Linguistics." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93.2 (1973): 146–57.
——, "The Ethical Basis of Arabic Grammar." *al-Karmil* 12 (1991): 9–23.
——, *Sībawayhi*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2004.

——, "Pragmatics and Contractual Language in Early Arabic Grammar and Legal Theory." In *Approaches to Arabic Linguistics: Presented to Kees Versteegh on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by E. Ditters and H. Motzki, 25–44. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2007.
Chomsky, N. *Syntactic Structures*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957.
Gaudefroy-Demombynes, M. Ibn Qutayba. *Introduction au Livre de la poésie et des poets, Muqaddimatu kitābi l-šiʿr wa-l-šuʿarāʾ: Texte arabe d'après l'édition De Goeje. Avec introduction, traduction et commentaire par Gaudefroy-Demombynes*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947.
Hava, J.G. *al-Farāʾīd: Arabic-English Dictionary*. 5th edition. Beirut: Dār al-Mašriq, 1982.
Heinrichs, W. "Mubālagha," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition.* Edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs. Brill, 2011. Brill Online. Harvard University. Accessed September 19, 2011 http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=islam_COM-1438.
——, "Naḳd (a.)," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition.* Edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs. Brill, 2011. Brill Online. Harvard University. Accessed September 19, 2011 http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=islam_COM-1438.
Iványi, T. "*Laḥn* and *Luġa*." *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 1 (1988): 67–86.
——, "*Qad yaǧūz fī sh-shiʿr*: On the Linguistic Background of the So Called Poetic Licenses in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*." In *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Grammar, Budapest 1–7 September 1991*, edited by K. Dévényi and T. Iványi = *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 3–4 (1991): 201–216.
Jahn, G. *Sībawaihi's Buch über die Grammatik: Übersetzt und Erklärt*. 2 Vols. Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1895.
Jihāmī, J. *Mawsūʿat muṣṭalaḥāt al-falsafa ʿinda al-ʿArab. Silsilat Mawsūʿāt al-Muṣṭalaḥāt al-ʿArabiyya wa-l-Islāmiyya*. Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān, 1998.
Kinberg, N. *A Lexicon of al-Farrāʾ's Terminology in his Qurʾān Commentary: With Full Definitions, English Summaries and Extensive Citations*. Leiden, New York: E.J. Brill, 1996.
Lane, E.W. *An Arabic-English Lexicon.* 8 Vols. New-Delhi: Asian Educational Studies, 1985.
Marogy, A.E. *Kitāb Sībawayhi: Syntax and Pragmatics*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010.
Mosel, U. *Die Syntaktische Terminologie bei Sībawayh*. 2 Vols. Munich: Dissertations- und Fotodrück Frank, 1975.
Owens, J. *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988.
Talmon, R. "*Naḥwiyyūn* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*." *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 8 (1982): 12–38.
——, "*Al-kalām mā kāna muktafiyan bi-nafsihī wa-huwa l-ǧumla*: A Study in the History of Sentence-Concept and the Sībawaihian Legacy in Arabic Grammar." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 138 (1988): 74–98.
——, *Arabic Grammar in its Formative Age: Kitāb al-ʿAyn and its Attribution to al-Ḫalīl b. Aḥmad*. Leiden, New York: Brill, 1997.
Troupeau, G. "La *Risālat al-Kitāb* de Sībawayhi." *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 48 (1973): 321–38.
——, *Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1976.
Versteegh, K. *Arabic Grammar and Qurʾānic Exegesis in Early Islam*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1993.
——, "The Arabic Tradition." In *The Emergence of Semantics in Four Linguistic Traditions*, edited by W. van Bekkum, J. Houben, I. Sluiter and K. Versteegh. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1997.
Wright, W. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language.* Translated from the German of Caspari and edited with numerous additions and corrections by W. Wright, LL.D.; revised by W.R. Smith and M.J. de Goeje. [3rd edition reprint]. 2 Vols. Combined. [N.p.]: Simon Wallenberg Press, 2007.

SPATIAL LANGUAGE IN THE *KITĀB* OF SĪBAWAYHI—THE CASE OF THE PREPOSITION *FĪ*/IN

Mohamed Hnid

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to explore a semantic field rarely developed in modern Arabic linguistic studies,[1] the relationship between language and space. One finds very early, in the *Kitāb*[2] and even before,[3] structured analysis of the way linguistic entities express different spatial values in Arabic. These relations are typically locatives as *al-iḥtiwāʾ* "containment", which is represented by *fī* "in", or *al-istiʿlāʾ*, "superimposition", which is expressed by *ʿalā*, "on". But they can also be directional—laying stress on a trajectory description—with one of the following two values: *al-ibtidāʾ* "beginning", and *al-intihāʾ* "end", activated by *min* "from" and *ʾilā* "to".

I will here examine the semantic structure of *fī* with the aim of describing its spatial configuration as it has been developed in the *Kitāb*.[4] As regards the specificities of his approach, I will first discuss a very short

[1] Among the rare studies on the question of the spatial meaning of the prepositions in Arabic, one can cite the study of K.R. Lentzner, *Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Arabic Prepositions* (Michigan: University of Texas, 1980).

[2] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*, ed. H. Derenbourg (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9), (2) ed. ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Maktabat al-Ḫānjī, (sd).

[3] In a book which is commonly attributed to al-Ḫalīl, one finds a spatial analysis of *ḥattā* (p. 204–205) dealing with the question of the boundaries of *ḥattā*, which is a key point in trajectory definition, in the famous example: أكلت السمكة حتى رأسَها, رأسِها, رأسُها, "I ate the fish up to its head" (al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal fī al-Naḥw* [Beirut: Mu'assasat ar-Risāla], 1995).

[4] This exploration would not have been possible without the crucial help of the theories developed in modern linguistics—especially cognitive semantics—about a topic which has been globally examined from the angle of linguistic space and perception by Miller Johnson-Laird, and more specifically from the angle of prepositional space by D. Bennett, *Spatial and Temporal Uses of English Prepositions* (London: Longman, 1975); A. Herskovits, *Language and Spatial Cognition* (Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1986); R. Langacker, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987); L. Talmy, *Toward a Cognitive Semantics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000); S. Levinson, *Space in Language and Cognition: Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); A. Tyler, and V. Evans, *The Semantics of English prepositions: Spatial Scenes, Embodied Meaning and Cognition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

text of Sībawayhi without considering any predefined analysis. Then, I will try to infer, from other examples and commentaries which I will comment on, the underlying structure that governs the spatial value of the preposition. Starting from the analysis later grammarians gave of his text, one can confirm that this approach has been universally valued by them. They developed a theory of the spatiality of the preposition by extending the perimeter of contexts in which the preposition could be used and giving a list of the parameters required for the definition of the semantic structure. So what are the distinctive features of Sībawayhi's approach to the spatiality of *fī*? What are the main parameters required to realize its semantic structure?

1. Terminology

In a very short passage on *fī*, Sībawayhi expresses a key notion which governed nearly everything he wrote about the spatial value of this preposition, which is *al-wiʿāʾ*, "the container": وأما في فهي للوعاء..., "Concerning *fī*, it expresses the meaning of the container, *al-wiʿāʾ*".[5] Two observations have to be mentioned here. First, the term *wiʿāʾ* has been used in texts which are subsequent to *al-Kitāb*, by Ibn al-Sarrāj:[6] *al-Uṣul*, by al-Zajjājī,[7] *Ḥurūf al-maʿānī*, by Māliqī,[8] *Raṣf al-mabāni* and *Maʿānī al-ḥurūf* by al-Rummānī.[9] However, other grammarians like Ibn Yaʿīš[10] in *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal*, al-Astarābāḏī[11] in *Šarḥ al-kāfiya*, Ibn Hišām[12] in *Muġni al-labīb* and al-Zamaḫšarī in *al-Mufaṣṣal*,[13] prefer another term, *al-ẓarfiyya* "the circumstance". The term *wiʿāʾ* so far has been less common, if not rarely used in most of the recent grammatical literature—particularly in grammar books—where one finds it replaced by another term, which is more general and less precise, i.e., *al-ẓarfiyya*, and from which two subcategories derive: *al-ẓarfiyya al-makāniyya* and *al-ẓarfiyya al-zamāniyya*

[5] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 508, Derenbourg 2,335/Hārūn 4, 226.
[6] al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl fī al-naḥw* (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1988), 1–412.
[7] Zajjājī, *Ḥurūf al-maʿāni* (Jordan: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1986), 12.
[8] ʾA. Māliqī, *Raṣf al-mabānī fī šarḥ ḥurūf al-maʿāni* (Damascus: Majmaʿ al-Luġa al-ʿArabiyya, 1975), 388.
[9] al-Rummānī, *Kitāb maʿāni al-ḥurūf*, ed. ʿA. F. I, Šalabī (Jedda: Dār ash-Shurūq, 1981), 96.
[10] Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* (Beirut: Dār ṣādir, sd) 8, 20.
[11] al-Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (Istanbul: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1979) 2, 327.
[12] Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī al-labīb ʿan kutub al-ʾaʿārīb* (Beirut: al-Maktaba al-ʿAṣriyya, 1987), 1–168.
[13] Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal*, 8–20.

(spatial circumstance and temporal circumstance). They both have two kinds of realizations: *al-ẓarfiyya al-ḥaqīqiyya* and *al-ẓarfiyya al-majāziyya*.

2. Approach

Although Sībawayhi did not give any definition of the notion which under examination here or any further detail of its inner characteristics, Sībawayhi provided examples that reveal its distinctive properties. The concise text of the *Kitāb* explains that the spatial value of *wiʿāʾ* can be represented under two main 'forms' or 'layers', the first of which is actual *wiʿāʾ* or prototypical meaning of *fī* as in هو في الجراب "It is in the jug",[14] هو في الكيس "It is in the bag"[15] and هو في بطن أمه "He is in his mother's belly".[16] The other form or layer is analogical *wiʿāʾ* as in هو في الغُل "He is in chains",[17] و في القبة "He is in the mosque"[18] and هو في الدار "He is in the house".[19] One can assume, on the basis of texts which are subsequent to *al-Kitāb*, that the approach of Sībawayhi implicates, a third level, i.e., the figurative *wiʿāʾ*, which he derives from the notion of *ittisāʿ*.

3. Analysis: Phrasal and Spatial Structure

Sībawayhi's grammatical representation is first based on a binominal phrasal structure in which only the following three fundamental components of the spatial relation are mentioned: the content, the container and *fī*. This structure maintains the preposition as a major semantic governor of the sentence. The fact that Sībawayhi chose this structure for all the examples in his text implicitly reveals that his conception of the standard—and prototypical—spatial relation was of structural nature. This relation is dominated by the central position of the *fī*. 'Syntactically' (*ʿāmil nawḥī*), it is a major governor, and 'semantically' (*ʿāmil dalāli*), it determines the two spatial roles of the two other nouns, namely the container and the content.

The pre-prepositional noun, or the content, is always a personal pronoun, *huwa* "he, it", a choice which is not arbitrary. Instead of revealing

[14] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 508, Derenbourg 2, 335/Hārūn 4, 226.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Ibid.

the lexical identity of whatever content he could mention, Sībawayhi implicitly underlined that this position may be occupied by any lexical reference but must also be validated by the post-prepositional reference. In this second position, and contrary to the first one, the lexical identity of the noun is always realised (a jug, a bag, a belly, etc.). This tells us that, even if the lexical features are not required for giving the content a proper sense, they are mandatory for the sense of the container, which is the real *wiʿāʾ* or in other words the lexical realisation of the prepositional spatial value.

I am here assuming that if the grammatical definition and the lexical definition are both relevant to understanding the approach of Sībawayhi, each of them gives different weights to the targeted noun. What is fundamental for the container is its lexical characteristics, which in turn can define precisely its shape and offer a detailed view of either its geometrical or functional dimensions. As for the content, which is grammatically definite, *huwa*, "he, it", it does not express any details of its inner characteristics despite having the possibility of being contextually definite. The single condition that has to be met is to match the geometric and functional dimensions of the container.[20]

Structurally speaking, the preposition maintains its central position between the two nominal blocks, confirming its relational function which is traditionally given to the class of particles in general and prepositions in particular.[21] Semantically speaking, *fī* gives a bit of information (order or instruction) which is appropriate for designating the spatial function of the two nouns, namely the content and the container. This crucial information is essentially of prepositional nature, but it further needs some lexical confirmation—special features—from the post-prepositional noun—the container—as already seen above. This means that if the two nouns do not lexically describe the required spatial information, they are nonetheless considered, through the prepositional semantic instruction, as container and content.[22]

---

20 It is possible to imagine, whatever difficult it may be in a standard relation of containment, a content which is bigger than its container. In the sentence "the tree is in the jug", we can imagine that the biggest part of the content, the tree, is geometrically outside the dimensions of the container, the jug, but still remains functionally speaking in the jug.

21 V. Brondal, *Théories des prépositions: Introduction à une Sémantique Rationnelle*. (Copenhague: Munskgaard, 1950), 50.

22 The semantic roles of container and content are principally attributed by the preposition as a grammatical instruction. This means that, even if this information is confirmed by the lexicon, its role remains limited to the description of the outer characteristics of the content—distinctive features—without any attribution of semantic role. We will show

4. The Representation of the *wiʿāʾ*

In what follows, three levels representing the notion of *wiʿāʾ*, i.e., actual, analogical and metaphorical, are distinguished and dealt with in some detail. The point, here, is to expose the fundamental structure of Sībawayhi's approach of spatial language in Arabic through his description of the semantic functioning of *fī*. Even if his text did not explicitly mention these levels, we presume that it is based on a structured approach with specific role and properties for each of its components. Moreover, Sībawayhi's theory of prepositional space—not only with *fī*- is a key element in nearly all the analyses proposed by later grammarians.

4.1 *The Actual* wiʿāʾ *or the Prototypical Spatial Form*

The actual *wiʿāʾ* is both the prototypical form of the semantic value of the preposition and its most perceptible or realizable figure. By "prototypical form", I mean a configuration that meets most of the conditions and parameters which are needed to represent a standard spatial relation of *iḥtiwāʾ* "containment". By "most perceptible," I mean an iconic representation which is illustrated by the nominal block in the first three examples given by Sībawayhi: The jug (*al-jirāb*), the bag (*al-kīs.*), the mother's belly (*baṭnu al-ʾummi*).

These lexical entities are almost identical in their semantic, lexical and (specifically) geometric properties. Four main conditions are required for meeting an iconic *wiʿāʾ*: a potbellied form, an upper opening, vacuity or three-dimensionality. These properties draw with accuracy the concept of a container in the *Kitāb* and inform us that, at this stage, the spatial relation is basically geometric as what determines the semantic information is the lexical content of the post-prepositional noun or the landmark.[23] I make here a distinction between the iconic form drawn by the lexicon, where the *wiʿāʾ* is an independent structure having its own distinctive features, and the *wiʿāʾ* as a spatial relation between two nouns.

how, with later grammarians, the grammatical status of *fī* which is so firmly based on its spatial component, allows it to attribute the role of container to nouns that do not lexically have the status of *wiʿāʾ*.

[23] We will use in this article two appellations from the field of cognitive semantics (Miller and Johnson-Laird, 386) when dealing with spatial relations; Landmark, for the post-prepositional noun—or the place where the thing is localized—here the container. Target, for the pre-prepositional noun or the thing localized, here the content.

4.2 *The Analogical* wiʿāʾ: *Resemblance vs. Conformity*

The second level of spatial relation, which is represented in the *Kitāb* by the examples 4, 5 and 6, is also characterized by some new properties. On one hand, Sībawayhi maintains the same grammatical status for the pre-prepositional noun, whatever it may be, target or content. It is grammatically—and even contextually—definite, but lexically indefinite. We assume, on the basis of this choice, that (at this level too) mentioning the lexical identity of the content is not mandatory for it to properly represent the spatial relation. On the other hand, the landmark, or the receptacle, is lexically determined—and grammatically definite—and also put forward one main characteristic: it does not actually fit the content, because it is either smaller—as in example 4—or bigger—examples 5 and 6. In example 4, "the chains" do not actually contain "the prisoner"; they cover a very small part of his body instead. In examples 5 and 6, the target—personal pronoun/he—does not cover more space than a small part of the landmark—location/house or mosque—and does not cover the entire space described by it.

Thus, the second level, the analogical *wiʿāʾ*, is essentially characterized by the geometric differences between the two nominal blocks. Despite this geometric dissimilarity, Sībawayhi considers the spatial relation as valid and admits that the preposition is realizing its semantic value. He comments on this level as follows:

وكذلك هو في الغلّ لأنه جعله إذا أدخله فيه كالوعاء له وكذلك هو في القبة وهو في الدار . . .

> Even in the sentence: "He is enchained", fī realizes the meaning of wiʿāʾ because when "he chained him" [lit. 'enter him in the chain'], he makes it [the chain] as a container and this is the same way we can analyze the sentences: "He is in the mosque", and: "He is in the house" . . .[24]

The concept كالوعاء "like a container" in the text of Sībawayhi informs us that the prepositional spatial value is realized by 'resemblance', (*šabah*)[25]—not by 'conformity', (*muṭābaqa*)—to the prototypical form, the actual *wiʿāʾ*.

---

[24] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 508, Derenbourg 2, 335/Hārūn 4, 226.

[25] In G. Ayoub "De ce qui 'ne se dit pas' dans le Livre de Sībawayhi: La Notion de *Tamṯīl*," in *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II*, eds. K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1990), 1–15, one finds an elaborated analysis of the different concepts which are activated by the notion of *šabah* and *tamṯīl* and the multiple connections resulting from their usage in the *Kitāb*.

4.3 *The Metaphoric or Abstract* wiʿāʾ *and the Notion of* ʾittisāʾ

Sībawayhi does not offer any example to illustrate this level; he limits his commentary to the following sentence instead: وإن اتسعت في الكلام فهي على هذا وإنما تكون كالمثل يُجاء به يقارب الشيء وليس مثله "When you widen the discourse, it is [*fī* or the spatial relation] like this [the second level]. It is like an example which is used to be similar to something [clarify something] but it is not the same example.[26]

The following two interconnected notions may characterize this representational level of the spatial relation: *al-ittisāʿ fi-l-kalām* "discourse-widening" and *al-mušābaha* "resemblance":

al-Ittisāʿ fi-l-kalām "discourse-widening" directly concerns the usage of language and the linguistic behavior of the speaker.[27] The widening of the usage of *fī* is also at the level of space: *fī* leaves the semantic core of the prepositional value—the tight perimeter of the prototypical level—and moves further, thus implicating new contextual elements. And because of the infinite number of examples and situations in which *fī* can be used, Sībawayhi did not propose, here, any example to put forward the open character of this category.

The second property of *al-mušābaha* "resemblance" remains connected to the semantic category as a whole, *wiʿāʾ*, so that the widening of the usage of *fī* does not have to disconnect it as completely from the standard form. The phrasal illustration of this level is put forward by another grammarian, Ibn al-Sarrāj, who gives two examples: في فلان عيب "Somebody has a flaw"[28] هو في عنفوان شبابه "He is full of youth"[29].

---

[26] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 508, Derenbourg 2, 335/Hārūn 4, 226.

[27] This notion which is also called "*saʿat l-kalām*" has multiple meanings that heavily depend on the domain in which it is used. For Versteegh it is closely related to the freedom of the speaker and is found in a special network of concepts like *al-ḥaḏf* "omission", *al-iḫtiṣār* "brevity", *al-taṣarruf* "flexibility", *al-taqdīr* "implication" or the couple *ḥaqīqī* "real" and *majāzī* "figurative" (K. Versteegh, "Freedom of the Speaker: The Term *ittisāʿ* and Related Notions in Arabic," in *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II*, eds. K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter [Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990], 282–5). In this study, what is particularly interesting is the wider meaning of this notion which pertains essentially to the speaker's transgression of the strict usage of the preposition. This transgression enables *fī* to leave the "narrow" domain of its canonical usage to the wide (*wāsiʿ*) domain of the unconventional usage of the preposition. See the introductory chapter of this notion in Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl* 2, 255.

[28] Ibid., 2, 412.

[29] Ibid.

Ibn al-Sarrāj comments further on these examples, using the same terms employed by Sībawayhi:

فإذا قلت في فلان عيب فمجاز واتساع لأنك جعلت الرجل مكانا للعيب يحتويه وإنما هذا تمثيل بذاك ...

> When you say: in somebody a flaw, it is a metaphorical usage that widens the discourse because you consider the 'man' as a place containing 'the flaw' ...[30]

وكذلك تقول أتيت فلانا وهو في عنفوان شبابه أي وهو في أمره ونهيه فهذا تشبيه وتمثيل أي أحاطت به هذه الأمور ...

> You also say: I met somebody and he was full of youth, which means he was powerful. That' is a resemblance between the two levels and the meaning is: "He was surrounded with these facts"[31]

Three observations are worth making. First, as far as the third level is concerned, we are far from the previous four conditions advanced by Sībawayhi to illustrate a prototypical realization of *wiʿāʾ*, the actual *wiʿāʾ*. However, this transgression moves the new realized spatial form out of the standard semantic categories in such a way that it still belongs to the semantic domain of *fī*.

Second, the text of Ibn al-Sarrāj represents an elaboration of the spatial theory of *fī*. On the one hand he confirms the analysis of Sībawayhi by mentioning the same examples and using the same terms. On the other hand, he puts forward two new notions, *al-iḥtiwāʾ* "containment", and *al-ʾiḥāṭa* "surrounding", each of them having their own semantic parameters.

Third, Despite the lexical nature of the post-prepositional nouns (somebody/ youth), which makes it difficult to see them as conventional receptacles, *fī* imposes consideration of its complement as *wiʿāʾ*, whatever its lexical distinctive features may be. This may induce two conclusions:

a) The central role of the preposition: *fī* actually determines the function and nature of the two nominal blocks, which are limited in lexically specifying the inner properties of the noun.
b) Unlike the category of prepositions as a whole, *fī* is heavily based on its grammatical and semantic field.[32]

---

30 Ibid.

31 Ibid.

32 A later grammarian describes the status of *fī* as follows: ...وأما في فلا تكون إلا حرفا ولا تكون إلا خافضة ولا تكون زائدة ومعناها الوعاء ومتى جاءت فلا يخلو منها الوعاء. As for *fī*, it can only

5. The *wiʿāʾ* as a Key Notion and the *Ẓarf*

The two terms the Arabic grammatical literature puts forward to express the semantic value of *fī*, "*al-wiʿāʾ*" and "*al-ẓarfiyya*" or "*al-ẓarf*"—mean lexically speaking the same thing. The lexical and grammatical texts confirm this terminology by using both of these names. In Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal and al-Lisān,[33] one finds these two definitions:

الظرف ماكان وعاء لشيء وتسمى الأواني ظروفا لأنها أوعية لما يجعل فيها وقيل للأمكنة والأزمنة ظروف لأن الأفعال توجد فيها فصارت كالأوعية لها...

> The *ẓarf* is the container of something. We call receptacles *ẓurūf* because they are containers in which we put things. Space and time are also called *ẓurūf* because verbs take place in them and so they become like their containers. . . .[34]

...وظرف الشيء وعاؤه...الظرف وعاء كل شيء حتى أن الإبريق ظرف لما فيه.

> The *ẓarf* of something is its container . . . the *ẓarf* is the container of everything, even the pitcher is a *ẓarf* of what is inside.[35]

In both of the passages above quoted, the expression *ẓarf* means 'envelope' and is closer connected to the semantic field covered by the preposition. However, the *wiʿāʾ becomes* a specific concept having its own application codes, which is not the case for the *ẓarf* or *ẓarfiyya* which expresses a general meaning of localization. I assume that this distinction is fundamental in revealing the inner semantic properties of the preposition when analysing some of its occurrences. So the concept of *wiʿāʾ* as presented by Sibawayhi enables any attempt to bring out the distinctive features of any spatial use of *fī*.

Applying new theories of linguistic analyses—generative semantics, predicate calculus, componential analysis and case grammar—to the study of Arabic prepositions, Ryding[36] prefers the term *ẓarfiyya* without mentioning the term *wiʿāʾ*. In the following examples *fī* expresses the spatial value of *ʿalā*, *al-istiʿlāʾ* "superimposition" as in: لقمة تبدو في الجبل "The

---

function as a particle and only assign the oblique case, and it is never semantically empty when it is used. Its meaning is 'a container' and when it is used this meaning is always realized (Ibn ʾAbī r-Rabī, *al-Basīṭ fī Šarḥ jumal al-Zajjājī* [Dār al-ġarb al-ʾIslāmī], 850).

[33] Jamāl ad-Dīn ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1994, 9–228).

[34] Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*, 2–40.

[35] Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab* 9, 228–9.

[36] Lentzner, *Arabic Prepositions*, 32.

peak appears on the horizon" and في جسدها الكثير من الجراح "Her body had many wounds on it".

She writes, "Arabic grammars occasionally list *al-istiʿlāʾ* "superiority" as one of the meanings of *fī* or else state that *fī* can be used *li-muwāfaqati ʿalā* "in accordance with *ʿalā*."[37] Certainly some grammarians confirm this phenomenon. Ibn al-Sarrāj notices that it is a result of identical semantic contexts:

> واعلم أن العرب تتسع فيها فتقيم بعضها مقام بعض إذا تقاربت المعاني فمن ذلك الباء تقول فلان بمكة و في مكة و إنما جازا معا لأنك إذا قلت فلان بموضع كذا وكذا فقد خبرت عن اتصاله والتصاقه بذلك الموضع وإذا قلت في موضع كذا فقد خبرت بفي عن احتوائه إياه وإحاطته به فإذا تقارب الحرفان فإن هذا التقارب يصلح لمعاقبة وإذا تباين معناهما لم يجز . . .
>
> The Arab speakers widen its usage and substitute some of them for others when they have similar meanings like *bāʾ*. You can say: "Somebody is at Mecca [*bi-Makkata*]" and "in Mecca [*fī Makkata*]". Both of the sentences are correct because when you say: "Somebody is at that or that place", you inform people about connection and contiguity to this place and when you say: "He is in that place", you inform us, by using *fī*, that he is contained and encircled in it. Therefore, when the values of two prepositions are similar, their substitution is permitted, but when their values are different it is not permitted. . . .[38]

According to Ryding,[39] the meaning realized in the two examples (1 and 2, given earlier) is *al-istiʿlāʾ*—semantic and spatial value of *ʿalā*—because of the phenomenon of *muʿāqaba*. We assume, despite the different arguments advanced to defend this hypothesis, that his analysis is not appropriate since it does not make any distinction between what is specific, *al-wiʿāʾ*, and what is generic, *al-zarfiyya*.

In the two sentences, *fī* realizes its spatial value—*al-wiʿāʾ* and not *al-istiʿlāʾ*—because of the following main reasons. As already seen above with Ibn Abī al-Rabīʿ, *fī* is characterized, by being heavily based on its semantic component; it is never used devoid of any semantic dimension, which is not the case in the other remaining prepositions. Furthermore, the condition laid down by Ibn al-Sarrāj—which allows the possibility of *muʿāqaba*, when there is a semantic resemblance (*ʾiḏā tašābahat l-maʿānī*)—is not fulfilled, because the similarity between *fī* and *ʿalā* in

[37] Ibid., 58.
[38] Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl* 2, 414.
[39] Lentzner, *Arabic Prepositions*, 32.

the two sentences is irrelevant. Applying the meaning of *al-istiʿlāʾ* instead of the meaning of *wiʿāʾ* considerably affects the semantic structure of the two sentences and neutralizes the core feature of their significance. In sentence 1 "the horizon" is the container of "the peak" because when one visualizes the spatial image of the sentence, one notices that the lower part of the mountain is unseen. It is contained in "the horizon" in such a way that it constitutes a receptacle of "the peak." In sentence 2, "the body" is a container of "the wounds" to express their depth and to put forward the pain of the subject. "The wounds" are not on her body; they are in her body. Two parameters are here mutually opposed; one is the superficiality conveyed by *ʿalā* and the other is the depth conveyed by *fī*, which is the meaning to which this example leads.

6. Developing the Approach of Sībawayhi

Through his concise text about the spatial value of *fī*, Sībawayhi established a structured representation of its semantic value, especially for its spatial component. This is the framework in which subsequent grammatical contributions about the spatiality of *fī* are elaborated, extending its fundamental meaning and encoding the way it works. This evolution corroborates what Carter called "the universal validity of his concept of language in the *Kitāb*"[40] and illustrates how Sībawayhi's spatial approach became the starting point from which later grammarians developed their hypotheses. Its validity can be confirmed in several ways.

First, the three representative levels advanced in his text are maintained in all the approaches dealing with the spatial value of *fī* from Ibn al-Sarrāj[41] in *al-Uṣūl*, until Ibn ʾAbi al-Rabī'[42] in *al-basīṭ*. Besides, the examples proposed in the *Kitāb* served as patterns, especially for the first two: actual *wiʿāʾ* and figurative *wiʿāʾ*. The third level, which he did not illustrate by any example because of the infinite possible phrasal combinations, is the point from which begins the widening of Sībawayhi's approach. So the first two dimensions of *wiʿāʾ* were considered implicitly valid and were not discussed. The general nucleus of interest, in later analyses of the spatial value of *fī*, was mainly various examples which allowed different

---

40 M.G. Carter, *Sibāwayhi* (India: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1.
41 Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl*, 2–412.
42 Ibn Abī al-Rabīʿ, *al-Basīṭ*, 850.

interpretations (*amṯila ḫilāfiyya*) to come from different contextual elements involved in the direct environment of the prepositional structure.

Second, later grammarians, developing Sībawayhi's spatial approach to *fī*, aimed particularly at harmonizing the open level—the third one—with the remaining two standard levels, as if the fundamental goal had to confirm the semantic component—the *wiʿāʾ*—as heavily based on all of the occurrences of the preposition. This confirmation is realized by proving, whatever the example and the contextual environment of *fī* may be, that the notion *wiʿāʾ* is inseparable from *fī*.

In *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya*, for example, al-Astarābāḏī proposed the two following sentences, لَأُصلبنكم في جذوع النخل "I would crucify you, certainly, in [on tree trunks] tree trunks" (Māliqī, 388) and (al-Astarābāḏī 2, 327), في النفس المؤمنة مائة من الإبل "Pay one hundred camels in the murder of a religious person" (al-Astarābāḏī 2, 327). Then he comments on the two sentences as follows:

> ... في النفس المؤمنة مائة من الإبل أي في قتلها فالسبب الذي هو القتل متضمن للدية تضمن الظرف للمظروف وهذه هي التي يقال إنها للسببية ...
>
> [The sentence] 'Pay one hundred camels in the murder of a religious person' would mean 'because of his murder'. The cause, which is 'the murder', involves 'the debt' as a container containing its content and this usage of *fī* is called causal[43]

In the two sentences, *fī* realizes its spatial value according to what al-ʾAstarābāḏī states. In this example, *fī* corresponds to the usage proposed by Ryding in example (2). If the container does not correspond in its spatial features to a conventional receptacle, *wiʿāʾ*, like "a trunk" or "a human body"[44] the presence of the preposition necessarily involves the consideration of the notion of *wiʿāʾ*. ʾAstarābāḏī further notes, ... إنها بمعناها لتمكن المصلوب في الجذع تمكن المظروف في الظرف ... "[*fī*] maintains its original value [the *wiʿāʾ*] because the 'crucified' is really contained [*mutamakkinun*] in the trunk resembling the relation of a container and its content.[45]

Finally, the development of the spatial value of *fī* by later grammarians and the widening of its representative status created an implicit, sophisticated, semantic network. This structured representation, which is

---

43 al-Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* 2, 327.

44 The two lexical units clearly violate the main four conditions advanced by Sībawayhi to illustrate the realization of a prototypical *wiʿāʾ*.

45 al-Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* 2, 327.

essentially a set of parameters, enabled *fī* to express its spatiality inside a codified structure where the nature of the activated relation particularly depends on the kind and the number of the respected parameters. The spatial 'theory' of *wiʿāʾ* advanced by Sībawayhi and developed by later grammarians depends on the realization of two interconnected categories.

On one hand, we have a group of spatial relations resulting from the usage of *fī* and differing from each other regarding the nature of the realized spatial relation. On the other hand, there are a number of parameters or conditions that serve as rules for the activation of the spatial relation. To the first group belongs the *wiʿāʾ* as a prototypical spatial form that respects the four conditions stated by Sībawayhi. In the same group are other relations representing less prototypical configurations of the standard image but still strongly connected to the iconic form, among which *al-ʾiḥāṭa* "surrounding", *al-iḥtiwāʾ* "containment", *al-ḥulūl* "localization", *al-ištimāl* "implication" and *al-taḍammun* "inclusion".[46]

To the second group belong a number of parameters—or conditions—including *al-manʿ* "control",[47] *al-tamakkun* "attachment",[48] *al-šumūl* "cover-ing"[49] *and al-iḫtiṣāṣ* "specificity".[50] This second group essentially regulates and codifies the functioning of the spatial value.

Thus, for the realization of each spatial relation, several parameters are required. *al-iḥtiwāʾ* "containment", for example, needs most of the above mentioned parameters because it has a prototypical status. It is very close to the notion of *wiʿāʾ* because of the similarity in the number of parameters they involve. Firstly, a relation of containment requires a container that controls the content, either actually or figuratively. Secondly, from the point of view of the content, it should be firmly attached (*mutamakkin*) to its container. Then, the spatial relation should enable the container to cover (*yašmala*) the content. Finally, each of the two actors in the spatial relation should be exclusively concerned (*muḫtaṣṣ*) with the other. This requires that they should not be semantically connected to, or dependent on, another semantic actor.[51] In contrast, a spatial relation

46 Ibid.
47 Ibn Abī al-Rabīʿ, *al-Basīṭ*, 850.
48 al-Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* 2, 327.
49 Māliqī, *Raṣf al-mabānī*, 389.
50 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*, 8, 20.
51 Spatially, *al-Iḫtiṣāṣ* does not differ from its grammatical meaning. When one considers, for example, that the prepositions are nominally specified, one means that they exclusively govern the nominal class. Here the parameter of specificity demonstrates the close

like *al-ḥulūl* “localization or presence” does not require the activation of different parameters because it represents a form of *wiʿāʾ* which is less prototypical.[52]

This approach can be explained by the analytic schema I have elaborated above, where I considered the *wiʿāʾ* as the core representation of the spatial value from which derive multiple configurations. On the same basis, the phenomenon of *muʿāqaba* “semantic interaction between prepositional values” is caused essentially by moving from central—prototypical form and implicated parameters—to new contextual situations. This movement invalidates the fundamental parameters belonging to the iconic form and requires the acquisition of new ones from new contexts. Consequently, any risk of expressing the semantic value of another preposition is a logical outcome whenever it is taken away from the semantic center of a region—or context—occupied conventionally by other linguistic units. We can assume, therefore, that the semantic interaction is a codified grammatical reaction having its own conditions and parameters, not just a contextual arbitrary phenomenon.

Conclusion

Sībawayhi’s approach to the spatial value of *fī* revealed a sophisticated concept of the way the preposition represents, communicates and articulates information about space. He managed to establish both theoretical and empirical frameworks for the spatiality of *fī* which have been taken over by subsequent works. His contributions on its geometric elements and functional parameters were also expanded and encoded by subse-

connection between the container and the content and excludes any additional semantic component from interferring with one of the two spatial actors. Each of them is exclusively concerned with the other.

[52] *al-Ḥulūl* is one of the farthest configurations of *wiʿāʾ*. It is far from its central semantic value and its prototypical representation, and this is the reason why it expresses a simple meaning of location. Ibn al-Sarrāj, comments on sentence (9) as follows: في ليست بمعنى على ولكنه شبه المصلوب لتمكنه من الجذع بالحالّ في الشيء “*fī* has not the value of *ʿalā* [in the sentence], but he [the speaker] compared the crucified to a content as if it were strongly attached to the trunk …” (Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl*, 1, 414). Māliqī, notes: السرحة موضع للثياب لأن المعنى بها الجسد بالثياب وإن حلت عليها فلا بد من استقرارها ولا يلزم أيضا الشمول كما تقدم “*Sarḥa* “big tree” is a place for the clothes because it is compared to the relation between the body and the clothes. So, when the clothes are on a tree, they should be stable on it. However, total covering is also unnecessary, as we have (said) before (cf. Māliqī, *Raṣf al-mabānī*, 389).

quent works. It may not be too early to precisely identify the different steps realized in the establishment of the representative structure of *fī*.

It appears that Sībawayhi's ideas of the spatial structure changed in three main steps. In the first stage, he tried to establish the fundamental elements required by the semantic structure. This explains in part the brevity of his commentaries and the shortness of the illustrations he gave. In the second stage, the aim of Sībawayhi was to consolidate and to develop the structure first realized. This can be seen in the text of Ibn al-Sarrāj, widening the examples advanced by Sībawayhi and illustrating his commentaries whenever he did not propose any example—such as at the third level of *wiʿāʾ*. In the third stage, he widened exploration of the contextual possibilities in which *fī* could appear, studying its spatiality at boundaries that link the *wiʿāʾ* with other prepositional and spatial values and not in the nucleus of the semantic structure which Sībawayhi achieved. This explains why subsequent approaches were essentially interested in the representation of the spatial value as a problematic one.

Even if this short article did not allow me to comment on the multiple operations and components which are mobilized when activating prepositional significance, I believe that they prove how deep Sībawayhi's structured analysis may be considered. They also prove, I may add, the originality of his representation found in the fundamental text of the *Kitāb* and later contributions.

References

Primary Sources

al-Astarābāḏī, Raḍi al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Astarābāḏī. *Šarḥ al-kāfiya*. Istanbul: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1979.

al-Ḫalīl b. Aḥmad Farāhīdī. *al-Jumal fī al-naḥw*. Edited by Faḫru al-dīn Qabawa. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1995.

Ibn Abī al-Rabīʿ, ʿAbdallāh b. Aḥmad b. ʿUbyd Allāh, *al-Basīṭ fī šarḥ jumal al-Zajjājī*. Edited by ʿAyyād b. ʿīd al-Ṯabītī. Beirut: Dār al-ġarb al-Islāmī, 1986.

Ibn al-Sarrāj, ʾAbū Bakr B. al-Sarī. *al-Uṣūl fī al-naḥw*. Edited by ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al Fatlī. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1988.

Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad ʿAbdallāh b. Yūsuf. *Muġnī al-labīb ʿan kutub al-ʾaʿārīb.* Edited by ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. Beirut: al-Maktaba al-ʿAṣriyya, 1987.

Ibn Manẓūr, Jamāl al-Dīn Mukarram b. Mukarram. *Lisān al-ʿArab.* Beirut: Dār ṣādir, 1994.

Ibn Yaʿīš, Muyaffaq ad-Dīn Yaʿīš b. ʿAlī. *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal.* Beirut: Dār ṣādir, (sd).

Māliqī Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Nūr. *Raṣf al-mabānī fī šarḥ ḥurūf al-maʿāni.* Edited by Aḥmad al-Ḫarrāṭ. Damascus: Majmaʿ al-Luġa al-ʿArabiyya, 1975.

al-Rummānī, ʾAbū al-Ḥasan. *Kitāb maʿāni al-ḥurūf.* Edited by ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Ismāʿīl Šalabī. Jedda: Dār al-Šurūq, 1981.

Sībawayhi, ʿAmr ibn ʿUṯmān. *Kitāb*, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Edited by H. Derenbourg. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag 1970), (2) ed. ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Maktabat al-Ḫānjī, (sd).

Zajjājī, Abū al-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Isḥāq. *Ḥurūf al-maʿāni*. Jordan: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1986.

Secondary Sources

Ayoub, G. "De ce qui ne se dit pas dans le livre de Sībawayhi: la notion de Tamṯīl." In *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*, edited by K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter, 1–15. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990.

Bennett, D. *Spatial and Temporal Uses of English Prepositions*. London: Longman, 1975.

Brondal, V. *Théories des prépositions: Introduction à une Sémantique Rationnelle*. Copenhague: Munskgaard, 1950.

Carter, M.G. *Sibāwayhi*. India: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Herskovits, A. *Language and Spatial Cognition*. Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Langacker, R. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987.

Leegh, G. *Semantics*. England: Penguin, 1975.

Lentzner, K.R. *Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Arabic Prepositions.* Michigan: University of Texas, 1980.

Levinson, S. *Space in Language and Cognition: Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Miller, G.A., and Philip Johnson-Laird. *Language and perception*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Talmy, L. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2000.

Tyler, A. and Evans, V. *The Semantics of English prepositions: Spatial Scenes, Embodied Meaning and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Versteegh, K. "Freedom of the Speaker: The Term *ittisāʿ* and Related Notions in Arabic." In *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*, edited by K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter, 281–93. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990.

THE RELATION BETWEEN FREQUENCY OF USAGE AND DELETION IN SĪBAWAYHI'S *KITĀB*

Hanadi Dayyeh

Introduction

The term *kaṯra* "frequent usage" has two meanings in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*: The first is associated with single words which the Arabs used frequently; the second is associated with structures which became known to both the speaker and the listener because they were repeatedly used. *Kaṯra* in the first meaning leads either to favouring a certain morphological form or a certain grammatical case which was frequently used, or to changing it to be different from its like. In its second meaning, *kaṯra* leads to *ḥaḏf* "deletion" of one of the elements of the structure (the verb, the noun, or the particle). The relation between *kaṯra* "frequent usage" and *ḥaḏf* "deletion", as presented in various parts of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*, is the subject of this study.

As for *ḥaḏf*, it is in the *Kitāb* different from *ʾiḍmār* "suppression", *iḫtizāl* "reduction", or *taqdīr* "suppletive insertion". It is that kind of *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" in which deletion is necessary. *Iḫtizāl* "reduction", on the other hand, is a specific kind of deletion where the verbal noun substitutes for the deleted verb. *Taqdīr* "suppletive insertion" is used in the *Kitāb* to express the meaning of "value", and not the sense of implying a certain elided element.

Sībawayhi is unique in establishing the relation between *kaṯra* and *ḥaḏf*. None of his contemporaries or successors exploited the far-reaching implications of this relationship. His awareness of this relation and his study of its grammatical implications are attested throughout the *Kitāb*—a fact that highlights the internal unity of the *Kitāb*, in its terminology, *šawāhid*, and analytical tools.

1. The Term *Al-Kaṯra* "Frequent Usage" in the *Kitāb*

The term *al-kaṯra* and its variants (*kaṯura, kaṯīr, akṯar*) appear in various parts of the *Kitāb*.[1] Sībawayhi uses *al-kaṯra* to justify syntactical,

[1] The root *k-ṯ-r* and its derivations appear more than 700 times in the *Kitāb*. Troupeau, Gerard, *Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi* (Paris: Kleinseich, 1976), 180–181. The present

morphological and phonological cases associated with verbs, nouns and particles. A close examination of the occurrences of the term *al-kaṯra* in *ʾabwāb al-fiʿl* "chapters on verbs", *ʾabwāb al-ism* "chapters on nouns", and *ʾabwāb al-ḥurūf* "chapters on particles/letters" shows that a relation is established between *al-kaṯra fī l-istiʿmāl* "frequency of usage" and *ḥaḏf* "deletion" of the verb, noun or particle in certain utterances.

1.1 Al-Kaṯra *in Sībawayhi's Chapters on Verbs*

The appearance of the term *al-kaṯra* in Sībawayhi's chapters on verbs in the *Kitāb* is restricted to a chapter where Sībawayhi discusses the dependent forms caused by a suppressed verb that remains covert because the meaning is self evident "باب ما ينتصب على إضمار الفعل المتروك إظهاره استغناء عنه".[2] In this chapter, Sībawayhi presents examples of deletion of the verb in utterances of command and cautioning "الأمر والتحذير", with or without *ʾiyyāka*, in utterances other than of command and cautioning "في غير الأمر والتحذير", and in utterances that gained the status of a proverb "في ما صار بمنزلة المثل".[3]

Citation 1—Utterances of cautioning with *ʾiyyāka*:

ومن ذلك قولك أيضا إياك والأسدَ وإياي والشرَّ كأنه قال إياك فاتقينَّ والأسدَ وكأنه قال إياي لأتقينّ والشرَّ... وحذفوا الفعل من إياك لكثرة استعمالهم إياه في الكلام فصار بدلا من الفعل.

> And an example of that you saying "beware of the lion" and "beware of evil", It is like he said "protect yourself from the lion and protect yourself from evil" … and they deleted the verb after *ʾiyyāka* because it is frequently used so it [*ʾiyyāka*] substituted for the verb.[4]

ʾIyyāka is frequently used in utterances of cautioning. The frequency of usage makes the verb "protect" known to both the listener and speaker, so it is elided. Frequency of usage in this citation led to deletion of the verb.

study is based on an examination of the occurrences of the root *k-ṯ-r* throughout the *Kitāb*. 60 *šawāhid*, in which *al-kaṯra* has a syntactical, morphological or phonological function, were extracted and used as the data for this study.

2 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 54, (1) ed. H. Derenbourg (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9) 1, 1161, (2) ed. Būlāq (1898–1900 [repr. Baghdad, 1965]) 1, 138.

3 For a complete list of the *šawāhid* taken from this section of *the Kitāb*, refer to Table 1.

4 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 54, Derenbourgh1, 116/ Būlāq 1, 138.

Citation 2—Utterances other than cautioning or command:

يا عبد الله

Yā [calling] ʿAbdallāhi

حذفوا الفعل لكثرة استعمالهم هذا في الكلام وصار يا بدلا من اللفظ بالفعل كأنه قال يا اريد عبد الله فحذف أريد وصارت يا بدلا منها لأنك إذا قلت يا فلان عُلم أنك تريده.

They deleted the verb because this [calling] is frequently used in talking and "*yā*" substituted for the utterance of the verb, as if he said "*yā*" I want ʿAbdallāhi so he deleted "I want" and "*yā*" substituted for it because if you said "*yā*" someone it is known that you want him.[5]

In this citation, frequency of usage also led to deletion. Sībawayhi explains that when calling someone it is known that you want this person due to frequent usage of *nidāʾ* "vocative". The verb consequently is elided and "*yā*" substituted for it.

Citation 3—Utterances that gained the status of a proverb:

ولا زعماتك

I am not deluded by your claims

ولم يذكروا ولا أتوهم زعماتك لكثرة استعمالهم اياه ولاستدلاله بما يرى من حاله أنه ينهاه عن زعمه.

And they did not mention "deluded" because they frequently used it and it is indicated in what is seen in the situation where he is prohibiting him from such claims.[6]

Frequent usage of the utterance ولا زعماتك led to the deletion of the verb. The utterance gained the status of a proverb, and proverbs are known to both the speaker and listener. It is worth mentioning here that Sībawayhi highlights another important clue that allows for the deletion of the verb: the fact that the listener is aware of the situation and knows the context of the utterance لاستدلاله بما يرى حاله. The knowledge of the elided element is essential for allowing deletion. The frequent usage of the utterance allows deletion because it makes the elided verb known to both the speaker and the listener.

---

5 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 57, Derenbourgh 1, 123/ Būlāq 1, 147.
6 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 56, Derenbourgh 1, 119/ Būlāq 1, 141.

1.2 Al-Kaṯra *in Sībawayhi's Chapters on Nouns*

The occurrences of the term *al-kaṯra* in relation to nouns appear in syntactical, morphological and phonological explanations that Sībawayhi gives to certain utterances.[7] In some of these explanations *al-kaṯra* is used to justify deletion of the noun, in others *al-kaṯra* justifies favouring a certain syntactical case or morphological form, and in few *al-kaṯra* leads to changing the noun to be different from its like. The following are three examples that illustrate the uses of *al-kaṯra* in the three above mentioned situations respectively.

Citation 4:

ونظير لا كزيد في حذفهم الاسم قولهم لا عليك وإنما تريد لا بأس عليك ولا شيء عليك ولكنه حذف لكثرة استعمالهم إياه.

And similar to "None like Zayd" where the noun is deleted [there is no one like Zayd], saying "*La ʿalayka*" where you mean "nothing wrong with you" [*lā baʾsa ʿalayk*] or "nothing against you"[*lā šayʾa ʿalayk*] but it (the noun-dependent) was deleted because they frequently used it.[8]

Citation 5:

وإن سميته بفعيلة صفة نحو القبيحة والظريفة لم يجز فيه إلا فعائل لأن الأكثر فعائل فإنما تجعله على الأكثر.

And if you named him an adjective that follows the pattern *faʿīla* like *al-qabīḥa* (the ugly) and *al-ẓarīfa* (the gracious), the plural is *faʿāʾil* because it is more frequently used so you follow what is most frequent.[9]

Citation 6:

وهي [الألف واللام] في الله بمنزلة شيء غير منفصل في الكلمة. . . وغيروا هذا لأن الشيء إذا كثر في كلامهم كان له نحو ليس لغيره مما هو مثله.

It (the definitive article *alif lam*) is in 'Allāh' inseparable. . . . and they changed it in this word because if a word is abundant in their utterances, it is treated differently from its like.[10]

---

7 For a complete list of the occurrences of *al-kaṯra* with nouns, refer to Table 2.
8 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 181, Derenbourgh 1, 309/ Būlāq 1, 354.
9 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 350, Derenbourgh 2, 99/ Būlāq 2, 101.
10 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 148, Derenbourgh 1, 268/ Būlāq 1, 310.

1.3 Al-Kaṯra *in Sībawayhi's Chapters on Particles/Letters*

Frequency of usage (*al-kaṯra fi-l-istiʿmāl*) in Sībawayhi's chapters on particles appears to justify deletion of the *ḥarf* "letter/particle" whether it is a particle or a letter.[11] In all the examples studied, *al-kaṯra fi-l-istiʿmāl* "frequency of usage" led to the deletion of the *ḥarf* "letter/particle".

Citation 7:

In discussing suppressed prepositions in sentences like لاقيته أمسِ that is originally لاقيته بالأمسِ Sībawayhi says:

> وليس كل جار يضمر لأن المجرور داخل في الجار فصارا عندهم بمنزلة حرف واحد فمن ثم قبح ولكنهم قد يضمرونه ويحذفونه فيما كثر في كلامهم لأنهم إلى تخفيف ما أكثروا استعماله أحوج.
>
> And not all prepositions are suppressed because the prepositional object is linked to the preposition, so they are both treated as one particle, then this was considered *qabīḥ* "ill-formed", but they may suppress and delete it in what is frequently used in their utterances because they need to reduce what is frequently used. [12]

Citation 8:

When explaining the deletion of the letter *nūn* from *laʿally* (لعلّي), Sībawayhi says:[13] فحذفوا هذه النون كما يحذفون ما يكثر استعمالهم إياه "So they deleted *nūn* as they delete what is frequently used".

1.4 *Meanings of* al-Kaṯra *in the* Kitāb

While *al-kaṯra* led to deletion of the verb, noun or particle in frequently used utterances, *al-kaṯra* in *ʾabwāb al-ism* "chapers on nouns" led also to favouring a grammatical case ending or a morphological form or to changing the noun to be different from its like.[14] This may be explained in

---

11 For a complete list of the *šawāhid*, refer to Table 3.

12 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 141, Derenbourgh 1, 253/Būlāq 1, 294.

13 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 213, Derenbourgh 1, 338/Būlāq 1, 386.

14 There is one example in which *al-kaṯra* leads to *tawassuʿ* "extension" in the use of adverbial nouns of time. These nouns are allowed to be annexed to verbs like saying هذا يومُ يقوم زيدٌ (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 260, Derenbourgh 1, 209/Būlāq 1, 460). Adverbial nouns of time are frequently used so they are treated differently from other nouns. These nouns can be annexed to verbs. In this sense, *tawassuʿ* means "the process by which a word is placed beyond its proper boundaries, as an extension of its normal domain" (K. Versteegh, "Freedom of the Speaker: The Term *ittisāʿ* and related notions in Arabic Grammar" in *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar* II, eds. K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter [Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company], 1990), 283. With this meaning in mind I included this citation in the examples where *al-Kaṯra* leads to changing the word to be different from its like.

two ways: First, frequency of usage leads to the three different functions (*ḥaḏf* "deletion", *tarjīḥ* "favouring" or *taġyīr* "changing"). If this explanation is valid then it is worth asking why frequency leads in one situation to deletion, in a second to favouring a syntactical case or morphological form, and in a third to changing the noun. Second, frequency has different meanings each associated with a different function.

Citations 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8 serve as examples to three patterns of deletion due to frequency of usage. Citations 1 and 2 are examples of the first pattern.[15] In these citations, frequency of usage led to deletion of the verb in utterances that are known to both the speaker and listener. There are enough clues for the listener to figure out the elided element. In this pattern, frequency of usage rendered the utterance known, so when the verb is deleted the meaning of the utterance remained clear.

Citation 3 is an example of the second pattern,[16] where the utterance due to frequent usage is considered a proverb. Proverbial expressions are known to the speaker and listener as well, so the elided element is retrievable by the listener.

Citations 4, 7 and 8 serve as examples of the third pattern.[17] In these citations Sībawayhi justifies deletion of an element of a structure simply because of frequency of usage. It is clear that in presenting the cause of deletion, Sībawayhi depends mainly on frequency of usage that makes the elided element known to the listener. It is worth noting here that he states that Arabs tend to reduce what they frequently use لأنهم إلى تخفيف ما أكثروا استعماله أحوج.[18] And they do so because both speaker and listener know the utterance and the deleted element can be retrieved.[19]

In citation 5, Sībawayhi favors a morphological form *faʿāʾil* as plural to *faʿīla* because it is more frequent. In this example frequency is associated with a single word that Arabs used in a certain morphological form more frequently.[20] Sībawayhi states فإنما تجعله على الأكثر "so you follow what

---

15 For complete list of the *šawāhid* that follow this pattern, refer to Table 4.

16 For complete list of the *šawāhid* that follow this pattern, refer to Table 5.

17 For complete list of the *šawāhid* that follow this pattern, refer to Table 6.

18 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 141, Derenbourgh 1, 253/Būlāq 1, 294.

19 Cf. A. Marogy, *Kitāb Sībawayhi: Syntax and Pragmatics* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010), 85–86.

20 Among the 60 citations used in this study, there are 16 cases where frequency of usage led to favoring of a certain grammatical case or morphological form (refer to Table 2). In all these citations frequency is used to describe single words that are used more in a certain syntactical or morphological form.

is most frequent". Here frequency is descriptive and associated with number of times a single word is used.

Citation 6 represents one of three instances where frequency led to changing the noun to be different from its like.[21] In the three examples frequency is associated with single words. It is descriptive. The noun 'Allāh' is used abundantly and that is why it is treated differently from other nouns. Sībawayhi says: وهم يغيرون الأكثر عن حال نظائره "they [Arabs] change the most frequently used to be different from its like".[22]

Kaṯra "frequent usage", then, appears in *the Kitāb* to convey two meanings: The first is associated with utterances that are frequently used, and consequently have become known to the speaker and listener. Frequency in this context leads to deletion of the verb, noun or particle in the utterance. The second meaning is descriptive and associated with single words. *al-kaṯra* "frequent usage" in this context leads to favouring a syntactical or morphological case or changing the noun to be different from its likes.

2. *Ḥaḏf* "Deletion" in the *Kitāb*

In an attempt to study deletion throughout the *Kitāb*, the following terms and their variants were examined: *ḥaḏf* "deletion", *ʾiḍmār* "suppression", *iḫtizāl* "reduction", and *taqdīr* "suppletive insertion". These terms may be confused to be synonyms. A fact that is observed in some Arabic Grammar books, where grammarians may use *ʾaḍmara* "to suppress" to mean *ḥaḏafa* "to delete", or *iḫtazala* "to reduce" to mean *aḍmara* "to suppress", or *taqdīr* "suppletive insertion" to mean *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" or *ḥaḏf* "deletion".[23] This study will show that these terms are not synonyms in the *Kitāb*.[24] Sībawayhi uses each term in a specific related context consistently wherever it appears in the *Kitāb*.

[21] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 148, Derenbourg 1, 268; 357/Būlāq 1, 310; 404 and chapter 310, Derenbourg 2, 39/ Būlāq 2, 42.

[22] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 227, Derenbourgh 1, 357/Būlāq 1, 404.

[23] I shall discuss the use of these terms in 2nd, 3rd and 4th century sources in section 4. As to recent books, refer to M. Maḫzūmī, *Fī al-naḥw al-ʿarabī* (Beirut:al Maktaba al ʿArabiya, 1946) and M. Yāqūt, *Qadāyā al-taqdīr al-naḥwī bayn al-qudamāʾ wa al-muḥdaṯīn* (Cairo: Dar al-Maʿārif, 1985) for samples of grammar books that uses the terms as synonyms.

[24] Cf. M.G. Carter, "Elision," in *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Grammar, Budapest 1–7 September 1991*, eds. K. Dévényi and T. Iványi = *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 3–4. (Budapest, 1991), 122.

2.1 *Between* Ḥaḏf *"Deletion" and* ʾIdmār *"Suppression"*

The difference between *ḥaḏf* "deletion" and *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" appears in parts of the *Kitāb* where Sībawayhi explains the 'suppressed verb' (*al-fiʿl al-muḍmar*). He distinguishes between two kinds of suppressed verbs: فعل مضمر مستعمل إظهاره "A suppressed verb that may be overt" and فعل مضمر متروك إظهاره "A suppressed verb that remains covert".[25] Examples of the latter were discussed in section 1.1 of this study. The suppressed verb that remains covert is a deleted verb due to frequency of usage.

As to the suppressed verb that may be overt, its *šawāhid* show that the verb is *muḍmar* "suppressed" and not *maḥḏūf* "deleted". Neither the word *ḥaḏafa* "to delete" nor its variants is used with the suppressed verb that maybe overt:

> وأما النهي فإنه التحذير كقولك الأسدَ الأسدَ والجدارَ الجدارَ والصبيَّ الصبيَّ فإنما نهيته أن يقرب الجدار المخوف المائل أو يقرب الأسد أو يوطئ الصبي وإن شاء أظهر مع هذه الأشياء ما أضمر من الفعل.
>
> As to prohibiting, it is cautioning like saying "the lion the lion", "the wall the wall", "the boy the boy", you prohibited him from getting closer to an inclined wall or a lion, or stepping on the boy, and if he wants he may mention the suppressed verb.[26]

The verb in this citation is referred to as *muḍmar* "suppressed" and not *maḥḏūf* "deleted". Sībawayhi states clearly that it is up to the speaker to mention the verb or not وإن شاء أظهر مع هذه الأشياء ما أضمر من الفعل.[27] This option is not given to the speaker in the case of a suppressed verb that remains covert. There is a clear distinction in the use of the terms *idmār* "suppression" and *ḥaḏf* "deletion". Sībawayhi uses the first when the suppressed verb may or may not be overt, and the second only when the verb has to remain covert.[28]

In discussing the suppressed verb that remains covert in utterances of cautioning, Sībawayhi says:

> كما تقول رأسَك والحائطَ وهو يحذره كأنه قال اتق رأسَك والحائطَ وإنما حذفوا الفعل في هذه الأشياء حين ثنّوا لكثرتها في كلامهم واستغناء بمايرون من الحال وما جرى من

---

[25] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 140, Derenbourgh 1, 247/Būlāq 1, 149.
[26] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 50, Derenbourgh 1, 107/Būlāq 1, 128.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 50–54, Derenbourgh 1, 107–117/Būlāq 1, 128–139.

الذكر وصار المفعول الأول بدلا من اللفظ بالفعل حين صار مثل إياك ولم يكن مثل إياك لو أفردته لأنه لم يكثر في كلامهم كثرة إياك.

> Like saying "Your head and/with the wall",[29] cautioning him as if saying protect your head, the verb is deleted in these utterances when the structure conveys duality due to frequency of usage and sufficiency with what is seen and said, the first dependent substitutes for the verb because it resembles *ʾiyyāka*, and it would not have been like *ʾiyyāka* if the structure is not dual because it is not frequent in their talk the way *ʾiyyāka* is.[30]

The frequency of using the structure رأسَك والحائط led to the deletion of the verb. Sībawayhi argues that It is the fact that this structure conveys duality that led to the deletion of the verb because in this structure only the first noun (dependent) resembles *ʾiyyāka* which is frequently used by Arabs allowing the deletion of the verb in structures like إياك والأسدَ.[31] If the structure is made up of one noun (dependent), Sībawayhi states that the verb may appear:

ولو قلت نفسَك أو رأسَك أو الجدارَ كان إظهار الفعل جائزا... فلما ثنيت صار بمنزلة إياك وإياك بدل من اللفظ بالفعل.

> And if you said "Yourself", "Your head" or "The wall" the verb may appear ... when you added a second, the structure gained the status of *iyyāka*, and *iyyāka* substitutes for the verb.[32]

Deletion of the verb in this example occurred when a condition of duality is fulfilled. This duality creates a structure that resembles the frequently used structure of *ʾiyyāka*. The verb in this case is referred to as *maḥḏūf* "deleted". If the utterance is made up of one noun (dependent) like "رأسَك" "أو اَلجدار", then the verb may or may not appear. In this case the verb is referred to as *muḍmar* "suppressed".

The distinction in the uses of the terms *ḥaḏf* "deletion" and *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" may be tracked throughout the book, and not only when discussing eliding a verb, but also a noun[33] or a particle.[34] The term *ḥaḏf*

---

[29] Sībawayhi explains that wāw in this example can be *wāw ʿatf* "conjunction" or *wāw maʿiyyah* (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 54, Derenbourgh 1, 117/Būlāq 1, 138).

[30] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 54, Derenbourgh 1, 117/Būlāq 1, 138–139.

[31] Ibid., Derenbourgh 1, 117/Būlāq 1, 138.

[32] Ibid., Derenbourgh 1, 117/Būlāq 1, 139.

[33] For examples of suppressed nouns refer to Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 140, Derenbourgh 1, 220; 241; 245/Būlāq 1, 258, 279; 284.

[34] For examples of suppressed nouns refer to Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 140, Derenbourgh 1/Būlāq 1, 407–408.

"deletion" appears with the frequently used structures where the elided element is covert, whereas *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" is associated with structures were the elided element may or may not appear.

With this conclusion in mind, a question may be raised regarding the relation between *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" and *ḥaḏf* "deletion". The terms are not used as synonyms in the *Kitāb*, however, they are related. Sībawayhi refers to the deleted verb as فعل مضمر متروك إظهاره. A deleted verb is a suppressed verb; however, it is a specific kind of *fiʿl muḍmar* "suppressed verb" that has to remain covert. The same can be said about deleted nouns and particles. Then, *ḥaḏf* "deletion" is a specific kind of *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" where the elided element remains covert. Throughout the *Kitāb*, Sībawayhi consistently uses *ḥaḏf* to refer to elided elements that remain covert in utterances that are frequently used.

2.2 *Between* Ḥaḏf *"Deletion" and* Iḫtizāl *"Reduction"*

The root *ḫzl* and its derivations appear 10 times in the *Kitāb*.[35] It is mainly used in discussing verbal nouns that are dependent due to a فعل متروك إظهاره "a covert verb". These verbal nouns appear in utterances where the speaker invokes God for or against, and in utterances other than invoking God.[36] In these utterances the verbal noun substitutes for the verb, so the verb is elided. Example of these verbal nouns: سقيا لك "May God quench your thirst", Sībawayhi explains: كأنك قلت سقاك الله سقيا. . . .وإنما اختزل الفعل ها هنا لأنهم جعلوه بدلا من اللفظ بالفعل "The verb was reduced here because it [the verbal noun] substituted for the verb". [37]

Studying the situations where *iḫtazala* "to reduce" is used, it is observed that *iḫtizāl* is associated with elided verbs in utterances where the verbal noun substitutes for the verb. In these specific situations the verb is said to be *iḫtuzila* "reduced" and not *ḥuḏifa* "deleted". Sībawayhi consistently uses the term *iḫtazala* "to reduce" in these situations, which means that he distinguishes between the two terms and does not use them as synonyms.

Although not a synonym to *ḥaḏf* "deletion", the term *iḫtizāl* "reduction", is related to it. It is associated with verbs that remains covert (*fiʿl matrukun iẓhāruhu*), however, in specific utterances where verbal nouns substitute for the elided verb. This may lead to a conclusion that *iḫtizāl* "reduction" is a specific kind of *ḥaḏf* "deletion" associated with certain

---

[35] Troupeau, *Lexique Index*, 8.
[36] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 62–66, Derenbourgh 1, 132–5/Būlāq 1, 158–162.
[37] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 61, Derenbourgh 1, 131/Būlāq 1, 157.

utterances. Sībawayhi consistently distinguishes between the uses of both terms throughout *the Kitāb*.

3. The Concept of *Taqdīr* in the *Kitāb*

The term *taqdīr* is commonly used to mean the supposition of an elided element that affected other elements in a structure. In this sense, the concept of *taqdīr* is related to *ʾiḍmār* and *ḥaḏf* "deletion". Consequently, a study of *taqdīr* as presented in the *Kitāb* is necessary when *ḥaḏf* "deletion" is a main subject of a study.

The word *taqdīr* in relation to syntactical explanations appears three times in *the Kitāb*:

First

ثم قلت أليس هذا زيدا منطلقا فانتصب المنطلق لأنه حال وقع فيه الأمر فانتصب كما انتصب في إنّ وصار بمنزلة المفعول الذي تعدى إليه فعل الفاعل بعدما تعدى إلى مفعول قبله وصار كقولك ضرب عبد الله زيدا قائما فهو مثله في التقدير و ليس مثله في المعنى.

Then you said *Is not that Zaydan munṭaliqan* (Zayd leaving) where *munṭaliqan* is dependent because it is circumstantial and similar to the noun after *ʾinna*, it [the circumstantial dependent] gained the status of a second object of a transitive verb like saying *ʿAbdullāhi hit Zaydan qāʾiman* (while standing), it is similar to it in syntactical value but not in meaning.[38]

Sībawayhi in this citation is building an analogy between two words in two different structures to explain the syntactical case of one of them. The word *munṭaliqan* is dependent in the first structure in the same way the word *qaʾiman* is dependent in the second although both structures do not convey same meaning.

Second

إنه كرامٌ قومُك وإنه ذاهبةٌ أَمَتُك فالهاء إضمار الحديث الذي ذكرت بعد الهاء كأنه في التقدير وإن كان لا يُتكلم به قال إن الأمر ذاهبة أمتُك.

'Verily are your people honorable' and 'Verily is your maid leaving' so the *haʾ* in *ʾinna-hu* refers to the suppressed speech that you mentioned after *haʾ* as if supposing, although not stated, he said that verily the issue is that your maid is leaving.[39]

[38] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 140, Derenbourgh 1, 247/Būlāq 1, 287.
[39] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 145, Derenbourgh 1, 259/Būlāq 1, 300.

The word *taqdīr* appears in this citation to mean the supposition of an elided word.[40] In the example given the word الأمر is elided and أمتك ذاهبة is independent as it is *ẖabar* (comment).

Third

فأنت قد تقول عبدُالله نعم رجلا مبتدأً به ولو كان نعم يصير لعبد الله لما قلت عبد الله نعم الرجلُ فترفعه فعبد الله ليس في نعم في شيء والرجل هو عبدالله ولكنه منفصل منه كانفصال الأخ منه إذا قلت عبدالله ذهب أخوه فهذا تقديره و ليس معناه كمعناه.

> You may say "Abdullāhi what a man (dependent)' starting with 'Abdullāhi, if *niʿma* is related to 'Abdullāhi you would not have said "Abdullāhi what a man (independent)', 'Abdullāhi has nothing to do with *niʿma*, the man is 'Abdullāhi but separated from it the way the brother is separated when saying "Abdullāhi, his brother left' ('Abdullāhi's brother has left), it has the same value (i.e. equivalence) but not the same meaning.[41]

Again, *taqdīr* is used here to mean the value of two elements in two parallel structures in an analogy. ʿAbdullāhi is separated from "the man" in the sentence عبدالله نعم الرجل the way it is separated from" the brother "in عبدالله ذهب أخوه. ʿAbdullāhi in the first and second structures is in similar situation.

It may be noticed that *taqdīr* is used only once in *AL Kitāb* to mean supposition of an elided element. This conclusion may even be supported by studying the occurrences of the word *taqdīr* in explaining certain morphological and phonological phenomena. In morphology, it is mainly used in the sense of forming a word according to a certain pattern.[42] In phonology, its use is restricted to words where *ʿayn* substitutes for the glottal stop (*hamza*).[43] In both areas, *taqdīr* is not used in the sense of supposing an elided element.

Based on the above, it may be concluded that the concept of *taqdīr* in *al-Kitāb* is not associated with *ḥaḏf* "deletion" or *ʾiḍmār* "suppression". It is used to mean similar value in *qiyās* "analogy" or similar pattern.

---

[40] The translation of *taqdīr* as suppletive insertion has first been suggested by Baalbaki, cf. Ramzi Baalbaki, *The Legacy of the Kitāb* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2008), 69, fn. 151.

[41] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 145, Derenbourgh 1, 260/Būlāq 1, 301.

[42] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 141, Derenbourg 2, 2; 59/Būlāq 2, 3; 63.

[43] Ibid., Derenbourgh 2, 1; 21; 39; 81; 83; 104; 128; 175; 254; 256; 262; 311; 313; 330; 410; 429/ Būlāq 2, 21; 42; 84; 86; 105; 126; 169; 239; 240; 245; 285; 286; 303; 370; 386 (note that the chapter numbers are not given here).

4. The Relation between Frequency of Usage and Deletion in Sources Other than the *Kitāb*

In the previous sections of this study, it is proposed that a relation between frequency of usage and deletion is established in the *Kitāb*. In this section, the present study will trace this relation in other language sources from the 2nd, 3rd and 4th century in an attempt to find out if any of Sībawayhi's contemporaries or successors noticed the relation between frequency of usage and deletion. From the 2nd century, the study will look into al Ḫalīl's (d. 175/791) *Kitāb al-ʿayn* and al-Farrāʾs (d. 207/822) *Maʿānī al-Qurān*. From the 3rd century, al-Mubarrad's (d. 285/898) *al-Muqtaḍab* and Ibn al-Sarrāj's (d. 316/929) *al-ʾUsūl fī al-naḥw*, and from the 4th century, Ibn Jinnī's (d. 392/1002) *al-Ḫaṣāʾiṣ* will be examined.

4.1 In Kitāb al-ʿAyn

Frequency of usage in *Kitāb al-ʿayn* leads to:

1. Merging two words to become one, example: *munḏu* (originally *min iḏā*)[44]
2. Deleting letters or short vowels from certain frequently used words, example: *ḏat* (originally *ḏawāt*—wāw is deleted)[45]
3. *Tawassuʿ* "extension" in the use of words[46]

Although *al-kaṯra* "frequent usage" has in *Kitāb al-ʿayn* similar functions to those presented in the *Kitāb*,[47] it is noticed that the relation between frequency of usage and deletion is not established the way it is in the *Kitāb*. Two observations are worth mentioning regarding the use of the term *al-kaṯra* "frequent usage" in *Kitāb al-ʿayn*. First, there is confusion in presenting the functions of *al-kaṯra* "frequent usage" for it may lead to two contradictory functions in the same example: wāw *ḏawāt* is deleted due to frequency, however, its *tāʾ* is pronounced due to frequency.[48] Second,

---

[44] al-Ḫalīl, *Kitāb al-ʿayn*, edited by M. al-Maḫzūmī and I. al-Sāmarraʾī (Baghdād: Dār al-Rašīd 1980–85) 8, 192. See also for more examples: 4, 116 and 8, 350.

[45] Ibid., 8, 207–208. See also for more examples, 4, 320 and 5, 301.

[46] Ibid., 5, 301.

[47] Refer to citation 25 in Table 2 for an example of merging two words to become one due to frequency of usage. The merging happens as a result of deleting letters, so basically it is another example of deletion due to frequency of usage. For *tawassuʿ* "extension" see footnote 5.

[48] Ibid., 8, 207–208.

al-kaṯra "frequent usage" leads to deletion of particles or vowels only. It is not associated with deletion of the noun or verb. Nouns and verbs in *Kitāb al-ʿayn* are suppressed and not deleted.[49] *al-Kaṯra* appears to justify the suppression and not deletion of the verb or noun,[50] and the deletion of the particle.

It is observed that the relation between frequency and deletion is not established in *al-ʿAyn*. However, it may be argued that its basis can be traced there. After all, *al-ʿayn* is a lexicon and not a grammar book like the *Kitāb*.

4.2 *In* Maʿānī al-Qurān

al-Kaṯra in al-Farrāʾs *Maʿānī al-Qurān* leads to:

1. Merging two words to become one either by treating them as one[51] or by deleting a letter.[52]
2. *Taḫfīf* "lightness" by treating diptotes as triptotes,[53] or by deleting a particle.[54]

In both cases the relation between *al-kaṯra* and deletion is not established, although a beginning of such a relation may be observed. al-Farrāʾ refers to deleting particles due to frequency. Also the concept of *ḫiffa* is related to deletion. [55] Sībawayhi establishes this relation in the *Kitāb* clearly, he states: ولكنهم يضمرونه ويحذفونه فيما كثر في كلامهم لأنهم إلى تخفيف ما أكثروا استعماله أحوج.[56] As to deleting the verb or noun, al-Farrāʾ, like al-Ḫalīl, speaks about *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" of the verb or noun and not *ḥaḏf* "deletion".[57]

Among his contemporaries it appears that Sībawayhi is unique in establishing a relation between frequency of usage and deletion. He is

---

[49] About the difference between suppression and deletion in *al-ʿAyn*, refer to Maḫzūmi, *Fī al-Naḥw al-ʿArabī* 207–224.

[50] al-Ḫalīl, *al-ʿAyn*, 1, 330; 3, 121; 215.

[51] al-Farrāʾ. *Maʿānī al-Qurān* (Cairo: Dar al Kutub al Miṣriyya, 1955) 1, 3–4.

[52] Ibid., 2, 144.

[53] Ibid., 1, 321.

[54] Ibid., 2, 314.

[55] On *ḫiffa "lightness"* and *ṯiqal "heaviness*, cf. Ramzi Baalbaki, "Some Aspects of Harmony and Heirarchy in Sībawayhi's Grammatical Analysis." *Zeitschrift fur Arabische linguistik* 2 (1979): 15.

[56] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 141, Derenbourgh 1, 253/ Būlāq 1, 294.

[57] Cf. K. Devenyi, "*ʾIḍmār* in the Maʿānī al-Farrāʾ," in *Approaches to Arabic Linguistics* 49*: Presented to Kees Versteegh on his Sixtieth Birthday*, eds. E. Ditters and H. Motzki (Leiden, Boston: Brill 2007), 61.

consistent in linking between frequency and deletion and using the exact terminology any where the relation appears in the *Kitāb*.

4.3 *In* al-Muqtaḍab

Influenced by Sībawayhi, al Mubarrad uses the citations that Sībawayhi uses in discussing eliding a verb, noun or particle and gives similar explanations. A comparative study between the two explanations shows that:[58]

First, the use of *al-kaṯra* in *al-Muqtaḍab* is almost nonexistent and when mentioned it is not related to deletion.[59]

Second, the term *ḥaḏf* "deletion" is not consistently used in *al-Muqtaḍab*. Instead Mubarrad uses terms like التقدير كذا والتأويل و استغنيت عن ذكر الفعل in explaining some citations.[60] Also, he might use *ḥaḏf* "deletion" and *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" exchangeably.[61]

It is noticed that frequency of usage is neglected as a cause for deletion in *al-Muqtaḍab*, instead the presence of a clue that refers to the elided verb becomes the condition for deletion. The clue may be the situation itself that is sufficient to know the elided element[62] or the knowledge of the listener.[63] al-Mubarrad does not recognize the role of frequency of usage in building the listener's knowledge.

4.4 *In* al-ʾUṣūl fī al-Naḥw

Like Sībawayhi, Ibn al Sarrāj differentiates between three types of verbs: An overt verb that cannot be covert, a suppressed verb that may be overt and a suppressed verb that remains covert.[64] In discussing the last two types of the suppressed verb, he uses Sībawayhi's *šawāhid* and explains the deletion of the verb neglecting frequency of usage. He focuses though on the presence of a *Dalīl* (an indicator of what is elided) as a condition to deletion.[65] Ibn al Sarrāj's *al-ʾUṣūl fī al-naḥw* shows that grammarians after

---

[58] Ten common citations were compared (*al-Kitāb–al-Muqtaḍab*): 1, 147–4, 202; 1, 147–3, 252; 1, 160–3, 226; 1, 138–3, 212; 1, 139–3, 215; 1, 171–3, 264; 1, 353–2, 151; 1, 279–3, 76; 1, 353–4, 429; 2,147–2, 302.

[59] al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, edited by M. ʿUḍaima (Beirut: ʿAlam al-Kutub) 3, 226; 2, 151.

[60] Ibid., 3, 252; 3, 212; 264.

[61] Ibid., 2, 308.

[62] Ibid., 3, 215; 3, 264; 2,151.

[63] Ibid., 4,429.

[64] Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Usūl fī al-Naḥw*, edited by ʿA.Ḥ. al-Fatlī (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1985) 2, 247.

[65] Ibid., 2, 254.

Sībawayhi, although influenced by him in discussing deletion, neglected the concept of frequency of usage, and focused on the situation of the utterance or knowledge of the speaker as a condition for deletion.

4.5 *In* al-Ḫaṣāʾiṣ

Ibn Jinni devotes a chapter in *al-Ḫaṣāʾiṣ* to *ḥaḏf*. He discusses deletion of a sentence, a word, a particle and a short vowel: وقد حذفت العرب الجملة والمفرد والحرف والحركة و ليس شيء من ذلك إلا عن دليل عليه وإلا كان فيه تكليف علم الغيب (Arabs deleted sentences ,words ,particles and vowels and they did so only while there is an indicator of it otherwise it would be entrusting knowledge of the unknown).[66] In the deletion chapter, frequency is neglected. Ibn Jinni is more interested in the context of the utterance as it is a powerful clue to the elided verb:

> ومن ذلك أن ترى رجلا قد سدد سهما نحو الغرض ثم أرسله فتسمع صوتا فتقول القرطاس والله أي أصاب القرطاس فأصاب الأن في حكم الملفوظ البتة، وإن لم يوجد في اللفظ غير أن دلالة الحال نابت مناب اللفظ.
>
> And among that when you see a man aiming an arrow towards the target and then shooting and then you hear a sound so you say "the target" meaning "he hit the target", hit, although not pronounced, it has the status of a pronounced verb, however, the situation itself substituted for the pronunciation of the verb hit.[67]

This citation is presented as an illustration of the deleted verb that is considered pronounced because of a clue that refers to it: باب في أن المحذوف إذا دلت الدلالة عليه كان في حكم الملفوظ به إلا أن يعترض هناك من صناعة اللفظ ما يمنع منه.[68] The focus in this citation is the context of the situation that substituted for the pronunciation of the verb. In this example, the verb may be overt, nevertheless it is referred to as *Maḥḏūf* "deleted". The distinction between *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" and *ḥaḏf* "deletion" seem to be insignificant.

---

[66] Ibn Jinnī, *al-Ḫaṣāʾiṣ*, edited by M.ʿA. al-Najjār (Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-Miṣriyyah al-ʿAmma, 1987) 2, 362.

[67] Ibid., 1, 286.

[68] Ibid., 1, 285.

Conclusion

This paper has shown that the relation between frequency of usage and deletion as established in the *Kitāb* was neglected after Sībawayhi. Deletion was developed as a concept but not in relation to *al-kaṯra* "frequent usage" and post-*Kitāb* sources limit themselves to setting rules and conditions for *ḥaḏf* "deletion". Although influenced by Sībawayhi, these sources did not pay attention to frequency of usage and its role in making the utterance known to the listener.

The relation between frequency of usage and deletion as established in the *Kitāb* highlights the internal unity of Sībawayhi's work. Sībawayhi establishes a link between the two notions wherever they appear in the *Kitāb*. What is more, he is consistent in using the right term of *ḥaḏf* "deletion", *ʾiḍmār* "suppression" or *iḫtizāl* "reduction" when describing the linguistic phenomena he is dealing with, as this study shows. Sībawayhi's unique achievement in establishing the relation between *kaṯra* "frequent usage" and *ḥaḏf* "deletion" among all his contemporaries and successors proves that the *Kitāb* still holds much linguistic treasure to be unearthed and studied.

References

Primary Sources

al-Farrāʾ, Abū Zakria Yehya b. Ziad *al*-Farrāʾ. *Maʿānī al-Qurān*. Vol. 1, edited by Muḥammad Alī al-Najjār and Aḥmad Yūsuf al-Najātī. Cairo: Dar al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 1955. Vol. 2, edited by Muḥammad ʿAlī al-Najjār. Cairo: al-Dar al-Miṣriyyah li al-Tảlīf. Vol. 3, edited by ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Šalabī. Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-Miṣriyya al-ʿĀmma, 1972.

al-Ḫalīl, Abū ʿAbdulraḥmān b. Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī. *Kitāb al-ʿayn.* 8 vols. Edited by Mahdī al-Maḫzūmī and Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrảī. Baghdād: Dār al-Rašīd 1980–85.

Ibn Jinnī, Abū al-Fatḥ ʿUṯmān. *al-Ḫaṣāʾiṣ.* Edited by Muḥammad ʿAlī al-Najjār. 3 vols. Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-Miṣriyyah al-ʿAmma, 1986–1988.

Ibn al-Sarrāj, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Sahl. *al-Usūl fī al-naḥw.* Edited byʿAbd al-Ḥussein al-Fatlī. 3 vols. Beirut: Muʾasasat al-Risāla, 1985.

al-Mubarrad, Abū al-ʿAbbas Muḥammad b. Yazīd. *al-Muqtaḍab.* Edited by Muḥammad ʿUḍayma. Beirut: ʿAlam al-Kutub, s.d.

Sībawayhi, ʿAmr ibn ʿUṯmān. *Kitāb*, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Edited by H. Derenbourg. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag 1970), (2) ed. Būlāq, 1898–1900 (repr. Baghdad, 1965).

Secondary Sources

Baalbaki, R. *The Legacy of the Kitāb*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2008.

——, "Some Aspects of Harmony and Heirarchy in Sībawayhi's Grammatical Analysis." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 2 (1979): 7–22.

Carter, M.G. "Elision." In *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Grammar, Budapest 1–7 September 1991*, edited by K. Dévényi and T. Iványi = *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 3–4 (1991): 121–133.
Dévényi, K. "ʾIḍmār in the Maʿānī al-Farrāʾ." In *Approaches to Arabic Linguistics* 49*: Presented to Kees Versteegh on his Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by E. Ditters and H. Motzki, 45–65. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2007.
Maḫzūmī, M. *Fī al-naḥw al-ʿarabī.* Beirut: al-Maktaba al-ʿArabiya, 1946.
Marogy, A.E. *Kitāb Sībawayhi: Syntax and Pragmatics*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010.
Troupeau, G. *Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi*. Paris: Kleinseich, 1976.
Versteegh, K. "Freedom of the Speaker: The Term *ittisāʿ* and Related Notions in Arabic." In *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*, edited by K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter, 281–93. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990.
Yāqūt, M. *Qadāyā al-taqdīr al-naḥwī bayn al-qudamāʾ wa al-muḥdaṯīn*. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1985.

Tables

Table 1

Page no. (Būlaq)	Citation	Frequency of usage led to
1/ 138	إياك والأسد Beware of the Lion	Deletion of the verb after ʾiyyāka
1/138	رأسه والحائط Your head and the wall	Deletion of the verb دع رأسه والحائط
1/147	أخذته بدرهم فصاعدا I took it for one Dirham and more	Deletion of the verb فذهب الثمن صاعدا
1/147	يا عبد الله O [calling] ʿAbdallāhi	Deletion of the verb يا أريد عبد الله
1/147	من أنت زيدا Who are you to mention Zayd	Deletion of the verb من أنت تذكر زيدا
1/148	أما أنت منطلقا انطلقت معك You are departing then I depart with you	Deletion of the verb أما كنت منطلقا انطلقت معك
1/149	مرحبا وأهلا Thou hast come to ampleness, spaciousness, and kinsfolk	Deletion of the verb رحُبت بلادك وأهلَت
1/353	تالله رجلا By God, what a man he is	Deletion of the verb تالله ما رأيت رجلا
1/141	ولا زعماتك I am not deluded by your claims	Deletion of the verb ولا أتوهم زعماتك

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Page no. (Būlaq)	Citation	Frequency of usage led to
1/142	ديار مية The dwellings of Mayya	Deletion of the verb أذكر ديار مية
1/142	كليهما وتمرا Both of them and dates	Deletion of the verb أعطني كليهما وتمرا
1/142	كل شيء ولا شتيمة حر Anything but cursing a free man	Deletion of the verb ائت كل شي ولا ترتكب شتيمة حر
1/143	انتهوا خيرا لكم Stop what you are doing and go for what is good	Deletion of the verb انته وادخل فيما هو خير لك
1/114	إذا كان غد فائتني Come to me tomorrow	Deletion of the verb إذا جاء غد فائتني
1/114	حينئذ الآن At the time now	Deletion of the verb حينئذ واسمع مني الآن
1/279	ما أغفله عنك شيئا He did not hide anything from you	Deletion of the verb دع الشك عنك

Table 2

Page no.	Citation	Frequency of usage led to
1/179	لولا عبد الله لكان كذا وكذا If it were not for ʿAbdallāhi	Deletion of noun لولا عبد الله كان بذلك المكان
1/353	لا كزيد رجلا No man like Zayd	Deletion of the noun لا أحد كزيد
1/145	أي والله Yes by God	Deletion of the noun أي والله للأمر هذا
1/146	لعمر الله لأفعلن By God, I will do …	Deletion of the noun لعمر الله المقسم به لأفعلن
1/42	إذا ابن أبي موسى بلغته If you reach Ibn Abi Moussa	Favoring of independent *ibn*
1/44	وثلاث كلهن قتلت I killed all three	Favouring of dependent *kullahuna*
1/137	راشدا مهديا May God make thee to be a follower of a right way	Favouring of dependent *rašidan mahdiyyan*

Table 2 (*cont.*)

Page no.	Citation	Frequency of usage led to
1/162	صبر جميل فكلانا مبتلى Be patient, we both are afflicted	Favoring of dependent *ṣabr*
1/110	سير عليه اليوم He walked for part of the day	Favoring of *al yawm*
1/130	إن خيرا فخير If it is for the good then it is good	Favoring of independent *ḫayr*
1/377	أتوني إلا أن يكون زيد They only come if Zayd is present	Favoring of independent Zayd
1/53	فداء لك May I be a ransom for thee	Favoring of oblique *fidả*
1/401–402	أي Which/ who	Favoring the use of the plural form in interrogative
1/460	هذا يوم يقوم زيد The day when Zayd stands up	Expanding the use of *Yawm*
1/318	يا ابن أم وابن عم O son of the matriarchs and patriarchs	Favoring of dependent *um* and *ʿam*
1/403	من زيدا Who is Zayd	Favoring of dependent noun that follows *man.*
2/42	ذا وذي وألا وألاء	Treating these nouns as particles (changing them to be different from its likes)
2/69	بعير حامض A sour camel	Favoring of the pattern حمضية
2/101	فعيلة	Favoring of the pattern فعائل as plural
1/351	لا غلام ظريف لك You do not have a gracious slave	Deletion of nunation
1/314	هذا زيد بن عمر	Deletion of nunation
1/316	يا تيم تيم عدي	Deletion of nunation
1/301	نعم وبئس	Deletion of the short vowel fatḥa

Table 2 (*cont.*)

Page no.	Citation	Frequency of usage led to
2/428	ست	Deletion of the letter (د)
2/430	بلعنبر	Deletion of letters from بني العنبر
2/264	الحجاج	Favoring of *imala* of the sound of *ʾalif*
1/310	الله	Changing the word to be different from its likes (the definite article is inseparable from the noun)

Table 3

Page no.	Citation	Frequency of usage led to
1/294	لاه أبوك/ لاقيته أمس By God, your father, I met him yesterday	Deletion of the prepositions
2/144	الله لأفعلن By God, I will do . . .	Deletion of the particle و
2/144	وجداء ما يرجى بها	Deletion of the particle رب
2/46	أنت أفضل You are better	Deletion of the preposition من
1/482	أما أن يغفر الله لك May God forgive you	Deletion of أنه
1/330	يا قوم O my kin	Deletion of the letter يا قومي
1/337	يا صاح O companion	Deletion of the letter يا صاحب
2/222	ابيضّ Become white	Deletion of the letter ابياضّ
2/140	الذي والتي / اللذيا واللتيا	Deletion of the letter' *alif*
2/165	أرى وترى	Deletion of *hamza*
2/343	أفعل	Deletion of *ʾalif* in the present tense
2/345, 347, 349	استحيت/ بعت/ طاح/ تاه	Deletion of the letters *wāw* and *yā*
1/301	نعم المرأة	Deletion of *ta* from نعم
1/386	لعلي	Deletion of the letter ن in لعلني

Table 4

Page no.	Citation	Cause of deletion
1/ 138	إياك والأسد Beware of the Lion	The verb is deleted because the utterance is frequently used and *ʾiyyāka* substituted for the verb
1/147	يا عبد الله Yā [calling] Abdallāhi	The verb is deleted because the utterance is frequently used and *yā* substituted for the verb يا أريد عبد الله
1/147	من أنت زيدا Who are you to mention Zayd	The verb is deleted because of frequency of usage and knowledge of the listener
1/149	مرحبا وأهلا Thou hast come to ampleness, spaciousness, and kinsfolk	The verb is deleted because of frequency of usage and the verbal noun substituted for the verb
1/353	تالله رجلا By God, what a man he is	The verb is deleted because it is known to the listener that the verb is not mentioned in this utterance due to frequency of usage
1/143	انتهوا خيرا لكم Stop what you're doing and go for what's good	The verb is deleted due to frequency of usage and knowledge of the listener

Table 5

Page no.	Citation	Cause of deletion
1/141	ولا زعماتك I am not deluded by your claims	Utterance gained the status of a proverb due to frequency of usage
1/142	ديار مية The dwellings of Mayya	Utterance gained the status of a proverb due to frequency of usage
1/142	كليهما وتمرا Both of them and dates	Utterance gained the status of a proverb due to frequency of usage
1/142	كل شيء ولا شتيمة حر Anything but cursing a free man	Utterance gained the status of a proverb due to frequency of usage
1/114	إذا كان غد فائتني Come to me tomorrow	Utterance gained the status of a proverb due to frequency of usage

Table 5 (*cont.*)

Page no.	Citation	Cause of deletion
1/114	حينئذ الآن At the time now	Utterance gained the status of a proverb due to frequency of usage
1/279	ما أغفله عنك شيئا He didn't hide anything from you	Utterance gained the status of a proverb due to frequency of usage

Table 6

Page no.	Citation	Cause of deletion
1/353	لا كزيد رجلا No man like Zayd	Frequency of usage
1/145	أي والله Yes by God	Frequency of usage
1/146	لعمر الله لأفعلن By God, I will do . . .	Frequency of usage
1/351	لا غلام ظريف لك You do not have a gracious slave	Frequency of usage
1/314	هذا زيد بن عمر	Frequency of usage
1/316	يا تيم تيم عدي	Frequency of usage
1/301	نعم وبئس	Frequency of usage
2/428	ست	Frequency of usage
2/430	بلعنبر	Frequency of usage
1/294	لاه أبوك/ لاقيته أمس By God, your father, I met him yesterday	Frequency of usage
2/144	الله لأفعلن By God, I will do.	Frequency of usage
2/144	وجداء ما يرجى بها	Frequency of usage
2/46	أنت أفضل You are better	Frequency of usage
1/482	أما أن يغفر الله لك May God forgive you	Frequency of usage

Table 6 (*cont.*)

Page no.	Citation	Cause of deletion
1/330	يا قوم O my kin	Frequency of usage
1/337	يا صاح O companion	Frequency of usage
2/222	ابيضّ Become white	Frequency of usage
2/140	الذي والتي/ اللذيا واللتيا	Frequency of usage
2/165	أرى وترى	Frequency of usage
2/343	أفعل	Frequency of usage
2/345, 347, 349	استحيت/ بعت/ طاح/ تاه	Frequency of usage
1/301	نعم المرأة	Frequency of usage
1/386	لعلي	Frequency of usage

PART II

SĪBAWAYHI IN HIS HISTORICAL AND LINGUISTIC CONTEXT

THE PARSING OF SĪBAWAYHI'S *KITĀB*, TITLE OF CHAPTER 1, OR FIFTY WAYS TO LOSE YOUR READER

M.G. Carter

The work which forms the basis of this paper appears as the 14th *mas'ala* in a compilation of short essays on miscellaneous linguistic topics attributed to Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī (d. 377/987). It deals with the parsing of the title of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*, Chapter 1, *hāḏā bāb ʿilm mā al-kalim min al-ʿarabiyya*, and presents fifty grammatical interpretations of the seven words which launched the science of Arabic grammar.

The authorship is questionable for various reasons. Biographical sources do not mention it among Abū ʿAlī's works, nor does he refer to it in other writings consulted, where, moreover, he uses *jarr* for the oblique case and not *ḫafḍ* as here. Šalabī[1] argues that all the *masāʾil* in the set are probably by Abū ʿAlī, and is followed in this by Sezgin[2] and the editor of the *Baġdādiyyāt*,[3] while the editor of the *Taʿlīqa*[4] is sceptical. A serious objection is that the very first *mas'ala* in the collection contains a brief excursus on lying which is quoted in full by al-Baġdādī (d. 1093/1682),[5] but there ascribed to Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 328/940). For convenience we will have to give Abū ʿAlī the benefit of the doubt.

The theme may be quite ancient: Abū ʿAlī himself states elsewhere[6] that "Abū l-ʿAbbās [al-Mubarrad (d. 285–6/898–9)] and earlier grammarians" used this chapter title as parsing practice for students, though it does not appear where it might be expected in al-Mubarrad's main work, the *Muqtaḍab*.

Predating Abū ʿAlī by a good generation is *al-Kalām fī taḥṣīl ʾiʿrāb qawl Sībawayhi hāḏā bāb ʿilm mā l-kalim min al-ʿarabiyya*, by al-Naḥḥās

---

1 Šalabī, *Min ʾaʿyān al-Shīʿa. Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī, ḥayātuh wa-makānuh bayn ʾaimmat al-ʿarabiyya wa-ʾāṯāruh fī l-qirāʾāt wa—l-naḥw bi-munāsabat murūr ʾalf ʿām ʿalā wafātih.* (Cairo, 1958), 568f.

2 F. Sezgin. *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 8, 108.

3 al-Fārisī, *al-Masāʾil al-muškila l-maʿrūfa bi-l-Baġdādiyyāt*, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ʿAbdullāh al-Sangāwī. (Baghdad, 1983), 365, n. 1.

4 al-Fārisī, *al-Taʿlīqa ʿalā Kitāb Sībawayhi*, ed. ʿAwaḍ ibn Ḥamad al-Qūzī. (Riyaḏ, 1990–96), 1, intro. 26.

5 al-Baġdādī, *Ḫizānat al-ʾadab wa-lubb lubāb lisān al-ʿArab*. (Būlāq 1882 and repr.), 3, 13.

6 al-Fārisī, *Baġdādiyyāt* 365.

(d. 338/950).[7] The manuscript could not be examined for this paper, but a secondary source reports that it contains "some 40–odd" parsings, which confirms its similarity to Abū ʿAlī's *masʾala* 14.

The only other monograph on this topic is credited to Ibn al-Munāṣif al-Naḥwī (Andalusian, d. ca 630/1233),[8] by al-Maqqarī in *Nafḥ al-Ṭib*, who tells us is that it contained the unbelievable number of 130 parsings, but there is no evidence that the work survives.

Not surprisingly the *Kitāb* commentaries all have something to say about the title. al-Sīrāfī (d. 368/979), who probably knew Abū ʿAlī, as they had masters and pupils in common, offers fifteen parsings,[9] and al-Rummānī (d. 384/994), achieves twelve[10] (they do not completely overlap with al-Sīrāfī). In two of Abū ʿAlī's other works the parsings do not reach double figures, but he devotes a number of pages to the syntax of the title, as do the Andalusians Abū Naṣr Hārūn b. Mūsā (d. 401/1010) and al-Aʿlam al-Šantamarī (d. 476/1083), the latter relying heavily on al-Sīrāfī.

The text given here (at the end of the article) is the version published by ʿAlī Jābir al-Manṣūrī;[11] the editor's punctuation and his interventions in round brackets are retained as printed, the present writer's are in square brackets. The serial numbers have been converted for clarity from words to digits, in italics are those which have been moved from the end of the line to the beginning; at no. [12] two parsings were combined as one, confusing both the scribe and the editor, and the correct numbering has been restored. Textual emendations are conjectural in the absence of a sight of the original manuscript. They include replacing *ḥayyiz* by *ḫabar* in [36]/[37]; the last phrase of [34] has been moved from the end of [33], where it is clearly misplaced; in [46] the printed text makes no sense, *rafʿ al-bāb muḍāfan ʾilā l-ʿilm wa-l-ʿilm munawwan bi-l-ḫafḍ ʿalā ʾanna l-ʿilm wa-mā kilāhumā ḫabar hāḏā "bābu* in indep. form annexed to obl. *ʿilmin* with *tanwīn* on the basis that *ʿilm* and *mā* are both predicates of *hāḏā*" and has been replaced by al-Sīrāfī's parsing;[12] the last phrase of [46] has been left as *ʾiḏā jamaʿa l-ṭaʿmayni* but with misgivings. The count of "sixty" parsings at the end of the text means only that this number could easily have

[7] Sezgin, *Geschichte* (1984) 9, 208.
[8] Sezgin, *Geschichte* 9, 62.
[9] al-Sīrāfī, Abū Saʿīd. *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, (photo of MS Atef Efendi 2548), fols. 1b–2a.
[10] al-Rummānī, *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, ed. al-Mutawallī bin Ramaḍān Aḥmad al-Damīrī. vol. 1. al-Manṣūra, 1992), 1, 104–116.
[11] *al-Mawrid*, 216–19.
[12] al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ* fol. 2a and margin, Ḫ. Ḥadīṯī, *Kitāb Sībawayhi wa-shurūḥuh*. (Baghdad, 1967), 185.

been reached (*qad tabluġ*), and even more than seventy if the ramifications were followed up more thoroughly.

The Table is an attempt to assign a place to every parsing, with some additional parsings from the *Kitāb* commentaries in square brackets.

The technical vocabulary on the whole reflects the typical discourse of the 4th/10th century grammarians, as indeed it should, if genuine. Unusually, along with the familiar term *taqdīr*, e.g. in [3] (only one token parsing will be cited in the examples), *talḫīṣ* occurs five times in the same sense, e.g. in [2] and *yatalaḫḫaṣ* in [6]. Whether this is a true technical term or a private usage cannot be ascertained: *talḫīṣ* normally means "abridging, summarising", but in Dozy[13] it is recorded with the meaning of "calculating" (*scil.* the number of folios per day al-Ṭabarī would have written over his lifetime), and is thus a perfect synonym of *taqdīr* "assigning a numerical or grammatical value".

In its brevity the work takes a number of methodological principles for granted. Thus the distinction between overt and implicit inflection is observed, e.g. in [8] *al-kalimi* is formally in obl. case by annexation but implicitly in indep. case as the agent of the passive verb implied in *ʿilm*, as shown in the paraphrase (*talḫīṣ*), *ʾan yuʿlama l-kalimu*.

Agreement is accounted for in several ways, by adjectival concord (*naʿt*) [49], apposition (*badal*) [47], repetition (*takrīr*) [38], correlation (*ḥaml*) [18], attraction or a kind of assonance (*ʾitbāʿ*) [12] and equivalence to a compound word *ḥilwun-ḥāmiḍun* "sweet-sour" [46].

Madḥ "praise" is used with striking frequency to account for the case in seventeen of the fifty parsings, both dep. [14] and indep. case [15]; in seven pairs of parsings either case is permitted [19/20] etc. *Madḥ* "praise" therefore appears in the Table with all the nouns and pronouns except those in obl. case.

For this paper three topics have been selected for more detailed comment.

(1) Deixis problems with *hāḏā*. As a demonstrative pronoun, *hāḏā* must refer to something, an issue left entirely untouched in our fifty parsings. However the commentators were not at ease with it. Their three explanations in the first row of the Table are incompatible, and reflect three different scenarios for the public presentation of the *Kitāb* pragmatically as an acoustic, not a literary event, hinging on whether the reference of *hāḏā*

13 *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabe.*

is anaphoric, cataphoric or purely rhetorical. Rather than review these explanations here it will suffice to link the problem with one which every reader would have called to mind, namely the prefatory demonstratives in the Qurʾān, interpreted in a "presentative" sense (*taqrīb*, see below), as in Sūra 55:43, *hāḏihi jahannamu llatī yukaḏḏibu bihā l-mujrimūn* "this is the Hell which the wrong-doers deny", quoted by al-Sīrāfī.[14] In some *Kitāb* commentaries, notably Abū ʿAlī[15] and Hārūn ibn Mūsā[16] an elaborate real-life situation is reconstructed in which the chapter title is the answer to a supposed question about what words are, with Hārūn stressing the vocative (*tanbīh*) force of the initial element of *hāḏā*.

It should be remembered that the *Kitāb* is one of the earliest books in Arabic, and appeared well before there were any conventions of composition and arrangement, so it has no formal start. If we are to believe that it was dictated to al-Aḫfash (d. 215/830) then this abrupt and enigmatic *hāḏā* is the first thing he would have heard as Sībawayhi personally addressed him. Curiously in one MS of the *Kitāb* the title of Chapter 1 precedes the *basmala*, suggesting that the custom of beginning every work with the *basmala* was not always observed.

The deixis in *hāḏā* at least gives our author the opportunity to account for dep. elements as "presentative predicates" *ḫabar al-taqrīb* in a number of parsings, e.g. [27], and cf. Sūra 11:72 *wa-hāḏā baʿlī šayḫan* "And this is my husband, an old man". Note that the indep. case can also occur with presentative *hāḏā*, as in *hāḏā l-shitāʾu muqbilun* "this is the winter approaching",[17] though this possibility is not entertained among our fifty parsings, where presentatives are confined to dep. nouns.

(2) *Tanwīn* issues. There may or may not be *tanwīn* on both *bāb* and *ʿilm*, and the structural implications would not have gone unnoticed. Two features invite comment:

(a) perhaps because it marks the end of a constituent, *tanwīn* is associated with potential repetition, e.g. [4] *hāḏā bābu ʿilmin* [*ʿilmi*] *mā l-kalimu*, [34] *hāḏā bābun* [*bābu*] *ʿilmin*. The plausibility of the analysis is not our concern, and we must assume that these constructions do occur in natural speech or poetry, as is certainly the case with [46] in the kind

[14] *Šarḥ* fol. 1b, Ḥadīṯī, *Kitāb* 183, followed by al-Šantamarī in *al-Nukat fī tafsīr Kitāb Sībawayhi*, ed. Yaḥyā Murād. (Beirut, 2005), 13f.

[15] *Taʿlīqa* 1, 6.

[16] Hārūn ibn Mūsā al-Qurṭubī, *Šarḥ ʿuyūn Kitāb Sībawayhi*, ed. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf ʿAbd Rabbih. (Cairo, 1984), 3–5.

[17] al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ* fol. 1b, Ḥadīṯī, *Kitāb* 183.

of inflectional repetition seen in the virtual compound *ḥilwun ḥāmiḍun* "sweet-sour".

(b) There is a correlation between *tanwīn* and the status of the verbal noun *ʿilm*. The impression is that when the *maṣdar* is felt to be more nominal than verbal it is annexed, as in [5], *ʿilmi mā l-kalimu* "the knowledge of what words are", and when it is more verbal than nominal it has *tanwīn*, [2] *ʿilmin mā l-kalimu* "knowing what words are". This reflects the same distinction in the active participle, e.g. nominal *qātilu ġulāmika* "the killer of your slave", against verbal *qātilun ġulāmaka* "one going to kill your slave". Objective and subjective annexation are of course taken for granted, as made explicit in the verbal paraphrases of *ʿilm* in [2] *taʿlamu* (active, objective) and [3] *ʾan yuʿlama* (passive, subjective).

(3) Interrogative and relative *mā* and problems of subordination. Redundant *mā* has no function, but when the referential pronoun (*ʿāʾid*) is omitted, relative *mā* is indistinguishable from interrogative *mā*, and *mā l-kalimu* can mean either "what are words?" [1] as a question (direct or indirect!), or "what words are" [2] as a relative clause. For pedagogical and expository purposes the ambiguity can be removed by substituting *allaḏī*, e.g. [6] *al-šayʾu llaḏī huwa l-kalimu* (also restoring the missing referential pronoun), or by replacing uninflected *mā* with inflected *ʾayy* "which[ever]". The *locus classicus* is *iḍrib ʾayyuhum ʾafḍalu* "hit whichever of them is best", with indep. case of *ʾayyu* as the subject of an interrogative clause (cf. Sūra 18:12, *ʾayyu l-ḥizbayni* in [1]), versus *iḍrib ʾayyahum ʾafḍalu*, with dep. *ʾayya* as the object of *iḍrib* in a relative clause, "hit the one of them who is best". So far so good: we must pass over the fact that there was just as much dispute about the inflection of *ʾayy* as there was about the status of *mā*, and proceed to the main difficulty for the grammarians, how to accommodate interrogative clauses syntactically into compound sentences when there was no standardised structure for indirect questions or even indirect speech.

Since the fifty parsings are only jumping-off points for the author to develop the material in the classroom or *majlis*, we can best start by listing here a series of interdependent assumptions which would have been elaborated during discussion. They are drawn largely from Abū ʿAlī's explicit treatment of the topic in his *Taʿlīqa* and *Baġdādiyyāt*.

(a) Relative clauses are pronominalised sentences, that is, they can function in any position where a pronoun can occur. "Pronominalised" is preferrable to the usual term "nominalised" here because so-called "nominalised" sentences cannot occur as the first term of annexation, a

characteristic they share with pronouns (including demonstratives). Thus in Arabic, as in English, we may say “the name of the book” and “the name of it” but not *“the it of the book”, likewise the clause in “the name of the book which he wrote” can be pronominalised as “the name of it”, but there is no *“the which he wrote of it”. Interrogative sentences, on the other hand, cannot by definition function as single nouns or be pronominalised at all (see *jumla* below): they remain autonomous sentences, and when they occur in the position of subordinate clauses, they are either direct objects of the verb in the special case of *qāla* “say”, or pseudo-objects of verbs of asking, knowing etc.

(b) The function of a clause being determined by its head, it is conventional to state only the inflection of the head, with the remainder of the clause being considered a mere adjunct (*ṣila*) in the Arab theory. Thus in [2] relative *mā* is said to have dep. case as the object of the verb, whereas we might see the whole clause as the object. The same procedure is followed with interrogative clauses, which by default have to appear in some function or other (*mawḍiʿ*, syntactical position), as in [5], where *mā* is said to have obl. status by the annexation of *ʿilm*, even though, as the subject in an interrogative *jumla, mā* cannot be directly operated on by an outside element (hence marked with * in the Table, row 4).

(c) When questions do seem to be objects of verbs of knowing, asking etc. (apart from *qāla*), the Arab theory is that these verbs are “suspended” (*muʿallaq*) or “neutralised” (*mulġā*), and do not operate grammatically on the interrogative sentences, which remain quotations of direct speech and not subordinate clauses. Note that both these concepts of neutralisation (*ʾilġāʾ*) and suspension (*taʿlīq*) arise in conversations between Sībawayhi, al-Ḫalīl and Yūnus, and most of the issues of neutralised verbs are covered in the *Kitāb*.[18]

(d) The unit of discourse labelled *jumla* is important. In later grammar *jumla* was subcategorised into various types of sentences and subordinate or coordinate clauses, but in the 10th century it is less specific, denoting a group of words with an internal syntactic structure which cannot be overridden by external operators. It is strongly linked to direct speech, and the terms *ḥikāya* and *ḥadīṯ* often occur alongside it.

The structural property of the interrogative *jumla*, that it cannot be pronominalised, is matched by a semantic property which it has in common with conditionals, imperatives, prohibitions, optatives, performatives and

[18] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 31, (1) ed. H. Derenbourg (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9) 1, 49–52, (2) ed. Būlāq (1898–1900 [repr. Baghdad, 1965]) 1, 61–4.

exclamatory sentences. All these are termed *ġayr wāǧib* by Sībawayhi, lit. "non-binding", i.e. not placing the speaker under the obligation of the speech contract to make a verifiable statement. We would call them "non-assertive" (and not "negative" as in some of the secondary literature, since non-assertive sentences can be positive or negative), and in later grammar most of these utterances were classified as *ʾinšāʾ*, lit. "creating", denoting speech acts intended to elicit a physical or linguistic reaction, in contrast to *ʾiḫbār*, the conveying of information in the form of declarative sentences.

As mentioned above, the peculiar status of indirect questions had already attracted the attention of Sībawayhi and his teachers, who could only account for it by appealing to the somewhat *ad hoc* notions of "neutralisation" (*ʾilġāʾ*) and "suspension" (*taʿlīq*) to explain how the main verb does not operate grammatically on the following clauses. Abū ʿAlī holds to this principle, but he stands out among the commentators for the thoroughness with which he applies it to the title of Chapter 1 of the *Kitāb*,[19] and particularly for extending it to the problem of whether questions can be agents of passive verbs.

Following Sībawayhi, Abū ʿAlī shows that the verbs which take interrogative clauses as apparent objects all belong to a category whose operation can be neutralised or suspended under certain conditions. Thus in *ʿalimtu Zaydan munṭaliqan* "I knew Zayd [was] gone" the verb has two genuine direct objects, while in *ʿalimtu ʾanna ẓaydan munṭaliqun* "I knew that Zayd [was] gone" its operation has been cancelled by *ʾanna*, and the (pronominalised) *ʾanna* clause occupies only the position of the first direct object. Applying the same analysis to *ʿalimtu mā l-kalimu* "I knew what words are", the interrogative clause, being a *jumla*, can likewise fill only one slot, yet *al-kalimu* can substitute for a second direct object in the same way as *munṭaliqun* in *ʿalimtu ʾanna Zaydan munṭaliqun*. In both cases the clause is in the position (*mawḍiʿ*) of a direct object without actually being one.

Abū ʿAlī also offers a second, pragmatic explanation. He supposes that the question has been put, "what are words?", and the chapter heading answers it by repeating the question, which he paraphrases as *hāḏā bābu ʾan taʿlama mā l-kalimu* "this is a chapter of [the fact] that you will know 'what are words?' ", effectively retaining direct speech.

---

[19] *Baġdādiyyāt* 366–9, *Taʿlīqa* 1, 6–8.

Abū ʿAlī goes a step further, and asks why questions cannot be the agents of passive verbs.[20] His hypothetical examples are *ʿulima ḍaraba Zaydun* "Zayd struck was known", *ẓunna kayfa Zaydun* "how is Zayd was thought", and *ʿulima ʾayna Zaydun* "where is Zayd was known". There is little difficulty in accepting that the first is impossible, but the second appears merely unlikely, while the third, especially if rendered in more natural English as "it was known where Zayd was", seems unobjectionable to Indo-European linguistic intuitions, yet all three are classified as *lā yajūz* "not permitted", and by the same token *ʿulima mā l-kalimu* "what are words was known" is also disallowed.

The formal argument for rejecting these sentences as passive agents is irrefutable: each item is a *jumla*, a syntactic complex which cannot be replaced by a single term, i.e. [pro]nominalised, therefore it cannot be a topic of predication, and *a fortiori* cannot be the agent of a verb either. There are supporting semantic arguments having to do with the special nature of the verb *ʿalima* "know", but they will not be explored here.

In practice constructions of the type *ʿulima ʾayna Zaydun* are rather rare, and the phenomenon still needs to be investigated. It is a grey area of Arabic syntax, which has no fully developed structure for reported speech and indirect questions.

The situation is still unresolved in modern Arabic: Cantarino[21] paints a picture of complete chaos, with relative structures in indirect questions and interrogative forms in relative clauses.

An obvious exception is *qīla* "was said" and its partner *ʾujība* "was answered" from dialectic, but these are a special case (see Guillaume).[22] With *suʾila* "was asked" we seem to have an intermediate type somewhere between *qīla* and *ʿulima*: a sentence such as *suʾila ʾayna Zaydun* (the example is made up) does not mean "[the question] 'where is Zayd?' was asked", but "he was asked, 'where is Zayd?' " (in more natural English

[20] Abū ʿAlī may be among the first to take this topic so seriously; it was obviously going round in his time, as it was raised earlier by Ibn al-Wallād (d. 332/943, see M. Bernards, *Changing Traditions. al-Mubarrad's Refutation of Sībawayh and the Subsequent Reception of the Kitāb*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1997: 123), and it was discussed by al-Fāriqī (d. 391/1001, see the extracts in the footnotes to al-Mubarrad, *Kitāb al-Muqtaḍab*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ḫāliq ʿUḍayma. (Cairo, 1965–8), 4: 62ff and the editor's remarks *id.* 1: 85f). Sībawayhi does not mention it, and the rôle of al-Mubarrad remains to be ascertained.

[21] V. Cantarino, *Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose*. Bloomington, London: Indiana University Press, 1974–51, 142ff, 3,97ff, 3,320.

[22] J.-P. Guillaume, "Fragments d'une grammaire oubliée: relations prédicatives non assertées, verbe déclaratif et verbes modaux d'après Sībawayhi (première partie)." *Bulletin d'Etudes Orientales* 35 (1983): 19–35.

"he was asked where Zayd was", that is, it is the passive equivalent of *saʾaltuhu ʾayna Zaydun* "I asked him where Zayd was" and the like. In *suʾila suʾālun* "a question was asked" (more accurately "some questioning was done" we have a *mafʿūl muṭlaq*, not a direct object, and it does not tell us the content of the question any more than *qīla qawlun* "a saying was said" tells us the contents of the statement, so these are not within the scope of Abū ʿAlī's analysis.

The fifty parsings are enumerated without any stated preference, but in the commentaries the vocalisation *hāḏā bābu ʿilmin mā l-kalimu min al-ʿarabiyya* is clearly preferred by all scholars for the title in the *Kitāb* itself, with the *tanwīn* of *ʿilmin* often spelt out and *mā l-kalimu* specified as an interrogative clause. It is difficult to be sure which of our fifty, if any, corresponds to this in every part. In [1] the *mā* clause is interrogative but *ʿilmun* is indep. (because it is treated as a quotation, like Sūra titles, *Sūrat al-Munāfiqūn* etc.), [2], [3] and [6] are explicitly relative clauses, while in [4] the nature of the *mā* clause is not stated, and in [5] the clause is interrogative, to be sure, but *ʿilmi* is without *tanwīn*. The remaining parsings add nothing, and this uncertainty is itself another argument against the authorship of Abū ʿAlī, who elsewhere leaves no doubt that *ʿilmin* and interrogative *mā* are the only authentic readings for the *Kitāb*.[23]

In four printed versions of the *Kitāb*, Hārūn's edition leaves the title unvowelled, while Derenbourg, Būlāq and a Lebanese pirate edition are all vocalised with *ʿilmi*, which is only the third preference in al-Sīrāfī, not proposed at all by al-Rummānī, and appears in nos. [5] (interrogative) and [6] (relative) and elsewhere in our fifty. The Būlāq, Hārūn and Lebanese editions are all based on Derenbourg (Humbert),[24] so we are looking at the reading of one Frenchman against the prevailing Muslim tradition. To be fair Derenbourg was only following the Paris copy (his MS A), which appears to have *ʿilmi*: in three other manuscripts consulted two were not vowelled anyway, but the third has a clear *tanwīn* (Humbert, *Voies* Pl. IX), and is thus consistent with the majority preference.

Inexplicably de Sacy in the first printed edition of this chapter[25] reproduces the short version of the title from Derenbourg's MS A (i.e. lacking *min al-ʿarabiyya*), as *hāḏā bāb ʿilm mā l-kalima* (no inflections are

[23] *Taʿlīqa* 1,3, *Baġdādiyyāt* 365, *al-tanwīn fī ʿilm wa-ʾanna mā istifhāmiyya*, and cf. the facsimile of the manuscript in *Taʿlīqa* 1, intro. 62.

[24] G. Humbert, *Les voies de la transmission du Kitāb de Sībawayhi*. (Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995), 30–4.

[25] Sacy, S. de. *Anthologie grammaticale arabe*. (Paris, 1829. Ar. text 152–54, Fr. trans. 361–63, annotations 381–88), 152.

marked), replacing the original plur. *al-kalim* with with generic fem. sing. *al-kalima*; he offers no justification for this choice (cf. his n. 2, p. 384), nor does Derenbourg remark on it. Certainly the plur. *al-kalim* is the original, and most commentators (al-Sīrāfī fol. 2a, al-Rummānī 113, al-Šantamarī 14, Hārūn 5) felt obliged to account for its distributive sense, as if they would have preferred the general term *al-kalām* "speech", reflecting the scholastic distinction between dividing the whole (*kalām*) into its parts and the generic (*kalima*) into the particular.

As for the motives for constructing the fifty parsings, there are three possibilities, pedagogical, systematic and professional. A pedagogical intention cannot be ruled out, though the technicalities of the parsings would have gone over the heads of all but the most advanced students, and it is hard to see what they would have learned from them.

In their range and complexity the parsings are proof of the highly developed state of grammar achieved within a century and a half of Sībawayhī's death, and it is very likely that they have a systematic purpose. By the 4th/10th century all the sciences were in a ferment of elaboration and demarcation within the emergent Islamic *Organon*: it is the era of the classification of the sciences, such as the *Mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm* of al-Ḫwarazmī (d. 387/997), and of the appearance of works with the title *ʾUṣūl al-naḥw* and *ʾUṣūl al-fiqh*, two closely related sciences which evolved in tandem.

Both Islamic law and Arabic grammar necessarily claimed to be exhaustive, that is, they operated on the principle that there was no problem which they could not solve, and here the parsings, like the hypothetical cases in law (*ṣuwar*), go far beyond pedagogy. They serve to test the system, often to limits which might seem absurd, but which can never stray into irrationality, for then they would simply be rejected. Common sense plays no part in this, only systematic coherence: as we have seen, the thirteenth century Andalusian Ibn al-Munāṣif is said to have devised 130 parsings of the *Kitāb* chapter title, in his case probably an attempt to outshine his rival grammarians in the East, while an anonymous sixteenth century scholar rose to the occasion with 1,800,000 ways to parse a certain verse of al-Mutanabbī.[26] A mediaeval European analogue is the debate (possibly spurious) about the number of angels who could dance upon a pinhead, where the aim was not to come to a numerically precise conclusion but to

[26] M.G. Carter, "Two works wrongly attributed to early Arab grammarians." *Islamic Quarterly* 18 (1974), 11.

show that within the limits of the human mind there are no topics which cannot be tackled.

These are typical activities of a civilisation in a state of intellectual homœostasis, to use a term which avoids the negative connotations of calling it a closed or stagnant world: it is the consequence of "closing the gate of *ijtihād*", which took place in the 4th/10th century, when the Muslim community decided to limit the linguistic and legal data to a finite body of text in order to provide a valid basis for deductive reasoning in the application of grammar and law, but which also led, inevitably, to counting up the number of verses, words and even letters in the Qurʾān.

In a more subtle way the proliferation of parsings, as with legal speculations, demonstrates another axiom of Islamic reasoning, to wit that the exercise of unaided human intelligence does not lead to unique and universally accepted conclusions but only, as the lawyers put it, to *ʾakbar al-ẓann* "the most likely supposition", with absolute certainly being confined to revealed truths.

Such exercises are more than simply displays of pedagogical virtuosity or academic ingenuity, however, and have good professional motives as well. Abū ʿAlī's fifty parsings are an assertion of his competence and a challenge to fellow grammarians to do better (perhaps even with the earlier forty parsings of al-Naḥḥās in mind). Islamic scholarship was an extremely disputatious arena in which a scholar's prestige depended on his ability to defeat opponents in public debate, and hundreds of controversies both oral and written are recorded, notably in the *majālis* literature. In the spirit of the Ḥadīṯ *iḫtilāf ʾummatī raḥma* "disagreement in my community is a mercy", scholars competing in *ṭalab al-riʾāsa* "the quest for leadership" strove to assert their superiority by having the last word, and many such encounters are collected under the title *al-ʾajwiba l-muskita* "answers which reduce the opponent to silence". There is no more famous (or infamous) incident in our field than the *Masʾala l-zunbūriyya*, in which Sībawayhi was humiliated by counter-evidence from Bedouin informants who, some say, had been bribed by al-Kisāʾī to provide false data.

What is truly remarkable is that every notion deployed in our fifty parsings is already explicitly stated or clearly foreshadowed in the *Kitāb*. There is a pleasing circularity in the fact that Sībawayhi's first words are analysed in terms of his own grammatical theory, and it is historically significant that, in order to demonstrate control of this theory and earn the scholarly authority it confers, Abū ʿAlī should remain entirely within the Sībawayhian system, even when making his private excursion into the

topic of questions as agents of passive verbs. This is one reason why the parsings were chosen for this paper, to confirm the rôle of the *Kitāb* as the "Foundation of Arab Linguistics", which has been the theme of this conference.

We are still talking about the parsings a thousand years later, so Abū ʿAlī has achieved more than he expected, as it is unlikely that he envisaged such a chronologically and geographically distant audience as this *majlis* of ours.

References

Primary Sources

al-Baġdādī, ʿAbd al-Qādir ibn ʿUmar. *Ḫizānat al-ʾadab wa-lubb lubāb lisān al-ʿArab*. Būlāq 1882 and repr.

al-Fārisī, Abū ʿAlī. *ʾAqsām al-ʾaḫbār*. Edited by ʿAlī Jābir al-Manṣūrī. *al-Mawrid* 7 (1978): 201–220.

——, *al-Masāʾil al-muškila l-maʿrūfa bi-l-Baġdādiyyāt*. Edited by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ʿAbdullāh al-Sangāwī. Baghdad, 1983.

——, *al-Taʿlīqa ʿalā Kitāb Sībawayhi*. Edited by ʿAwaḍ ibn Ḥamad al-Qūzī (el-Kozi). Riyaḍ, 1990–96.

Hārūn ibn Mūsā al-Qurṭubī, *Šarḥ ʿuyūn Kitāb Sībawayhi*. Edited by ʿAbd al-Laṭīf ʿAbd Rabbih. Cairo, 1984.

al-Mubarrad, Abū l-ʿAbbās. *Kitāb al-Muqtaḍab*. Edited by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ḫāliq ʿUḍayma. Cairo, 1965–8.

al-Rummānī, ʿAlī b. ʿĪsā. *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*. Edited by al-Mutawallī bin Ramaḍān Aḥmad al-Damīrī. vol. 1. al-Manṣūra, 1992.

Sībawayhi, ʿAmr ibn ʿUṯmān. *Kitāb*, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Edited by H. Derenbourg. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag 1970), (2) ed. Būlāq, 1898–1900 (repr. Baghdad, 1965), (3) ed. ʿA. S. M. Hārūn. Cairo, 1968–70 and later eds.

al-Sīrāfī, Abū Saʿīd. *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, photo of MS Atef Efendi 2548.

al-Šantamarī, al-Aʿlam. *al-Nukat fī tafsīr Kitāb Sībawayhi*. Edited by Yaḥyā Murād. Beirut, 2005.

Secondary Sources

Bernards, M. *Changing Traditions. Al-Mubarrad's Refutation of Sībawayh and the Subsequent Reception of the Kitāb*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1997.

Cantarino, V. *Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose*. Bloomington, London: Indiana University Press, 1974–5.

Carter, M.G. "Two works wrongly attributed to early Arab grammarians." *Islamic Quarterly* 18 (1974): 11–13.

Dozy, R., *Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes*. 3rd edition. 2 vols. Leiden: Paris, 1967.

Guillaume J.-P. "Fragments d'une grammaire oubliée: relations prédicatives non assertées, verbe déclaratif et verbes modaux d'après Sībawayhi (première partie)." *Bulletin d'Etudes Orientales* 35 (1983): 19–35.

Ḥadīṯī, Ḫ. *Kitāb Sībawayhi wa-shurūḥuh*. Baghdad, 1967.

Humbert, G. *Les voies de la transmission du Kitāb de Sībawayhi*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
Sacy, S. de. *Anthologie grammaticale arabe*. Paris, 1829. Ar. text 152–54, Fr. trans. 361–63, annotations 381–88.
Sezgin, F. *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums*. vols. 8, 9. Leiden: Brill, 1982, 1984.
Šalabī, ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Ismāʿīl. *Min ʾaʿyān al-Shīʿa. Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī, ḥayātuh wa-makānuh bayn ʾáimmat al-ʿarabiyya wa-ʾāṯāruh fī l-qirāʾāt wa—l-naḥw bi-munāsabat murūr ʾalf ʿām ʿalā wafātih*. Cairo, 1958.

PARSINGS AND FUNCTIONS of *hāḏā bāb ʿilm mā l-kalim min al-ʿarabiyya*

1. هذا	[anaphoric to something present]		[cataphoric to sth. coming]	[rhetorical or mental deixis]
2. باب	بابُ annexed to *ʿilm* 1. predicate of *hāḏā* 2. *bābu ʿilmin* in appos. to *hāḏā*, with *mā* as predicate 3. *madḥ*	بابٌ not annexed to *ʿilm* 1. predicate of *hāḏā* 2. pairs with *ʿilmun* like *ḥilwun ḥāmiḍun* 3. *madḥ*	بابَ annexed to *ʿilm* 1. *qaṭʿ* from *hāḏā* 2. *taqrīb* 3. *madḥ*	بابًا not annexed to *ʿilm* 1. *ḥāl* 2. *qaṭʿ* from *hāḏā* [3. *tamyīz*] 4. *taqrīb* 5. *madḥ*

3. علم	عِلْمِ annexed to *mā* or *al-kalimi* if *mā* redundant 1. made obl. by *bābu, bāba* or intended repetition of *bābu* after *bābun, bāban*	عِلْمٍ not annexed to next word, made obl. by *bāb*, or by: 1. intention to repeat *ʿilm* 2. intended repetition of *bābun*	عِلْمُ annexed to *mā* or *al-kalimi* if *mā* redundant 1. predicate of *hāḏā* 2. predicate of elided *huwa* 3. apposition or *naʿt* to *bābun* 4. *badal* of *hāḏā* 5. *madḥ*	عِلْمٌ not annexed to next word 1. pred. of *hāḏā* 2. predicate of elided *huwa* 3. apposition or *naʿt* to *bābun* 4. pairs with *bābun* like *ḥilwun ḥāmiḍun* 5. *madḥ*	عِلْمَ annexed to *mā* or *al-kalimi* if *mā* redundant [1. *tamyīz* of *bāb*] 2. *taqrīb* with *hāḏā bābun* 3. *madḥ*	علمًا not annexed to next word [1. *tamyīz* of *bāb*] 2. *mafʿūl muṭlaq* of elided verb 3. *naʿt* of *bāban* 4. *taqrīb* 5. *madḥ*

Table (*cont.*)

4. ما	interrogative ما 1. indep., subject of *al-kalimu* 2. indep., predicate of *al-kalimu* 3. * obl. by annexation of *ʿilm*	relative ما with elided هو A. independent functions: 1. agent of passive verb in *ʿilm* 2. apposition to *bābu*(*n*), like a *naʿt* 3. repeating contents of, or agreeing with *hāḏā bābu*(*n*) 4. after elided *huwa* 5. predicate of *hāḏā* after *qaṭʿ* 6. *madḥ* of *bāb* or *ʿilm* B. dependent functions: 1. object of active verb in *ʿilm* 2. after elided *uḏkur* 3. *taqrīb* with *hāḏā* 4. *madḥ* of *bāb* or *ʿilm* C. oblique functions: 1. annexation of *ʿilm* 2. agreeing with *ʿilmin*	redundant, emphatic, indef. ما 1. redundant *mā*, no function at all 2. emphatic *mā*, no grammatical effect 3. indefinite *mā*, no grammatical effect
5. الكلم	الكلمُ 1. predicate of *mā* 2. subject of *mā* 3. predicate of elided *huwa* 4. agent of passive sense of *ʿilm* 5. agent of passive *yuʿlam* 7. predicate of *hāḏā* 6. *madḥ* of *hāḏā* or *bāb*	الكلمَ only with redundant, emphatic or indefinite *mā* 1. object of verb implied in *ʿilm* 2. *taqrīb* with *hāḏā* 3. *madḥ* of *hāḏā* with indefinite *mā*	الكلمِ only with redundant, emphatic or indefinite *mā* 1. annexed by active *ʿilm* 2. annexed by passive *ʿilm* 3. apposition to *ʿilmi*, *ʿilmin*

Table (*cont.*)

4 + 5 ما الكلم	if علم paraphrased as أن تَعلَمَ A. interrogative *mā*: 1. *dep. function as obj. of *ʿilm* B. relative *mā* 1. object of active sense of *ʿilm* with suppressed *huwa* 2. annexed by *ʿilm* in active sense	if علم paraphrased as أن يُعلَمَ A. interrogative *mā* 1. *indep. function, agent of *ʿilm* B. relative *mā* 1. agent of passive sense of *ʿilm* with suppressed *huwa* 2. annexed by *ʿilm*, passive sense	not applicable if ما redundant
6 من العربية	explanatory	partitive	1. predicate of *hāḏā* 2. predicate of *mā*

قوله هذا باب علم ما الكلم (من العربية) فيه خمسون جوابا

1 . هذا بابُ علمٍ، باضافة الباب الى العلم، وتنوين العلم، ورفع العلم، والباب خبر هذا، وهو خافض للعلم، والكلمُ خبر ما، وموضع ما رفع بالكلم، والعلم غير ناصب لها كما لم ينصب العلم أياً في قوله تعالى "لنعلم أيُّ الحزبين [أحصى]" (الكهف 12/18)

2 أن يقضى على (ما) بالنصب، بفعل مشتق من العلم مسمى فاعله تلخيصه تعلم به الذي [هو] الكلم، وتأويل ما الذي وصلتها هو (الكلم) وعائدها (هو) والكلم يرفعه (هو)

3 ارتفاع (ما) بمشتق من العلم لم يسم فاعله، وتقدير هذا المضمر: هذا باب علم يُعْلَمُ [به] ما الكلم من العربية

4 خفض (ما) بالعلم المضمر، والتلخيص: هذا باب علم علم ما الكلم، فاكتفى بعلم من علم

5 سقوط التنوين من العلم، وان يقال: هذا باب علم ما الكلم (فما) مخفوضة بإضافة العلم اليها، وليست فاعلة العلم ولا مفعولته

6 أن يقضى على (ما) بالرفع على تأويل فعل ما لم يسم فاعله، وان كان العلم يخفضها في الظاهر ويتلخص: العلم هذا باب أن يعلم [به] الشيء الذي هو الكلم

7 خفض الكلم باضافة العلم اليه، وما توكيد تقديرها: باب علم الكلم

8 أن يقضى على الكلم بالرفع وهو مخفوض في اللفظ تلخيص هذا باب أن يعلم الكلم
9 تنوين العلم بالخفض، ورفع الكلم بفعل من العلم غير مسمى فاعله، وما توكيد لا [حكم] لها بالاعراب
01 ينون العلم مخفوضا، وينصب الكلم بمشتق من العلم مسمى فاعله و ليس لـ(ما) موضع من الاعراب اذكانت لا تفيد الا التوكيد
11 خفض العلم، والعلم منون بنية تكريره، و(ما) توكيد للكلام
12 ارتفاع (ما) والعلم منون مخفوض على الاتباع لباب ومشبها بالنعت
13 فان رفعت (ما) على التكرير على ما في الباب من ذكر هذا فهو الوجه 13
14 وإن نصبت [ما] على المدح للمضمر الذى فى الباب كان ذلك 14
15، 16 وإن رفع على المدح او على التكرير على المضمر فهما 15، 16
17 وإن جعلت ما توكيدا توكيد الكلم على الاعراب فى الباب فهو 17
18 وإن حمل على اعراب المضمر فهو 18
19، 20 وإن مدح المضمر بالكلم فنصب الكلم او رفع [فهما] 19، 20
21 وإن حملت (ما) على خفض العلم والعلم منون فهو 21
22، 23 وإن صرفت [ما] الى المدح لعلم فنصبت او رفعت باضمار اذكر وتقدير هو فهما 22، 23
24 وإن كان (ما) توكيدا والعلم منون بالخفض والكلم محمول على خفض العلم فهو 24
25، 26 وإن نصب العلم او رفع على المدح لعلم فهما 25، 26
27 وإن جعلت (ما) منصوبة على خبر هذا، وهذا تقريب، والعلم منون، مخفوض فهو 27
28 وإن نصبت الكلم على خبر التقريب و لم يحكم على (ما) بموضع فهو 28
29، 30 وإن نصبت (ما) او رفعت على المدح فهما 29 و 30
31، 32 ،وإن نصب الكلم او رفع على المدح لهذا[و]ما غير معرفة فهما جوابان 31 و 32

33 هذا باب علم ما الكلم من العربية بتنوين كل واحد من باب وعلم، على ان بابا خبر هذا، وعلم نعت باب وما مقرة على الاجوبة التى بينت فيها

34 هذا باب علم ما الكلم بتنوين الباب ورفعه، وخفض العلم على [نية] التكرير بتقدير: هذا بابٌ [بابُ] علم ما الكلم [والعلم مخفوض منون]

35 وإن خفض الكلم، وقدرت (ما) [بتقدير] التوكيد فهو 35

36، 37 وإن نون الباب بالرفع ونصب [علم] على [خبر] التقريب او على معنى الكلام الذى تلخيصه: هذا علمٌ علمَ ما الكلم فهما 36 و 37 والعلم مضاف فيهما بالنصب

38 وإن خفض العلم بتكرير الباب مع الاضافة فهو الجواب 38

39، 40 وكذلك إن نصب على المدح او رفع على المدح فهما جوابان 39 و 40

41 وإن قيل هذا باب بنصب الباب، وتنوين العلم بالخفض ما الكلم من العربية فهو الجواب 41 ينتصب فيه الباب على القطع من هذا، وخبر هذا (ما)، والكلم صلة (ما)

42، 43 وإن]نصب[الباب على المدح لهذا، او رفع ممدوحا فهما جوابان 42 و 43

44 انتصاب الباب على المدح، والعلم منون بالخفض ويعرب (ما) بعلم على المذاهب المذكورة، وخبرهما (من العربية) 44

[45] انتصاب الباب على خبر التقريب، والعلم منون مخفوض، وارتفاع الكلم على خبر هذا، وما غير معربة

46 رفع الباب [والعلم على ان بابٌ وعلمٌ] كلاهما خبر هذا كما قالت العرب: هذا حلو حامض إذا جمع الطعمين

47 رفع الباب وهو مضاف الى العلم، والعلم منون على البدل من هذا و(ما) خبر هذا

48 هذا باب علما ما الكلم من العربية بنصب علم على خبر التقريب، و(ما) معلقة بالعلم

49 هذا بابا علما بتنوين الباب والعلم، وهما منصوبان على ان الباب حال من هذا والعلم نعته و(ما) خبر هذا

50 هذا بابا بتنوين الباب ونصبه علم ما الكلم بخفض العلم، واضافته على ان خبر هذا من العربية،والعلم يخفضه تكرير الباب عليه

وقد تبلغ هذه الوجوه ستين وتزيد على السبعين اذا استقصي التفريع فيها، والذى بُيّنَ من الاصول فيه غنى عن ذكر ما أمسك عن ايضاحه وإيثار الاختصار اولى اذا عرفت البغية، وحصلت الفائدة، تم ذلك

ZAYD, ʿAMR AND ʿABDULLĀHI: THEORY OF PROPER NAMES AND REFERENCE IN EARLY ARABIC GRAMMATICAL TRADITION

Amal E. Marogy

Introduction

When studying the use of proper names in early Arabic grammatical tradition, and more particularly in *Kitāb* Sībawayhi, a puzzle immediately arises. Proper names that have acquired the status of prototypical or focal exemplars in traditional Arabic grammar are restricted to Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāhi, while certain other names that one would have expected to find are conspicuously absent, e.g., Muḥammad or Aḥmad.

The pioneering contribution of Sībawayhi to the "grammar of names"[1] is still terra incognita. This paper seeks to show that Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāhi are not random names or gap fillers introduced when illustrating grammatical phenomena, but are referents evoked to make linguistic features of 'good' Arabic salient in their extra-linguistic context. There are clear interactions between grammar and the socio-historical context within which names as linguistic entities occur and are organized. An account of proper names is therefore needed and in what follows I explore some of the ways of using prototypical names in the *Kitāb*. Some linguistic features of proper names are referred to and analysed. Further, three key components of proper names are emphasized. These components are differentiated in the *Kitāb* and coincide with the three components of grammar, i.e. semantic, pragmatic and syntactic.

1. The Extralinguistic Scene of the *Kitāb*

There are various modes of describing the world surrounding us and expressing our relationship with it, but the giving of the name to someone or something constitutes the single most effective way of not only identifying but also communicating.

[1] This term is adopted from J.M. Anderson, *The Grammar of Names*. Oxford Linguistics. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Against this communicative backdrop of onomastics, I wish to draw attention to the neglected grammar of names in the *Kitāb* and its relevance to grammatical theory in general. I also set out and clarify the linguistic and extra-linguistic role of proper names in the *Kitāb*.[2] What concerns us here is the fact that Sībawayhi dedicated considerable space in his work to assessing how far the morphosyntax of proper names is semantically and pragmatically informed.

Before addressing questions related to proper names, something should first be said about the social and religious milieu in which Sībawayhi lived and worked. It would be unnecessary repetition to cover this historical period at any length.[3] However, if we are to deal with a number of issues of particular relevance on a sound linguistic and extralinguistic footing, a few facts should be presented to elucidate the topic under discussion and emphasize the inherent relationship between the choice of particular prototypical names and the prevailing social and cultural order within which these names occur.

The beginning of ʿAbbasid rule ushered in a period of prosperity and relative peace which was matched by urban development and intellectual achievements. The surge of intellectual activity, pioneered mainly by Christians, Persians and Jews, mirrored the cultural vigour and efflorescence that characterised one of the greatest period in Islamic history and especially that of Caliph Hārūn al-Rašīd's reign (170–193/789–809). It was during the reign of this caliph that Sībawayhi (d. 180/796) worked and developed further his intellectual activity as a linguist.

The Muslim rulers established in the conquered areas a new religious hegemony which aimed to encourage those embracing the new religion to break with previous ways of life and form a new community based on solidarity and equality. However, Islam's rejection of traditional tribal society and forced settlement of new converts in Kūfa and Baṣra failed to do away with tribal antagonism. In spite of measures that aimed to bind the tribal converts in ways that cut across tribal lines, old tribal rivalry and affiliation were still very real to Arab society in the eighth century, and Arabs never denounced their attachment to lineage and descent. This is not difficult to prove, for anyone who looks at any linguistic account in the *Kitāb* will appreciate the weight given to tribal judgment in linguistic

[2] The discussion will be restricted to anthroponyms or proper nouns with human reference.

[3] See, for instance A.E. Marogy, *Kitāb Sībawayhi: Syntax and Pragmatics*. (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics No. 56, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010), 1–45.

matters.[4] When Sībawayhi is seeking tribal arbitration, he is aware of the importance of quoting his authoritative sources of good Arabic verbatim. His trustworthy informants were most probably men who relied on the reputation of their tribe.

Attachment to tribal affiliation was apparent in the new garrison cities, which were divided along tribal lines into quarters and districts, in most cases with their own tribal mosques. In the chapters dealing with the names of districts,[5] the boundaries are shown to have been clearly demarcated according to the type of the new settlers. What is more, the geographical distribution of local tribes and groups of early comers is reflected linguistically in the way their names are treated as masculine or feminine, diptotes or triptotes. We learn from the *Kitāb* that when the names of Maʿadd, Qurayš or Ṯaqīf are mentioned in speech, they usually refer to the groups, not the tribes of Maʿadd, Qurayš and Ṯaqīf and hence to the districts named after them, whereas Tamīm usually refers to the dominant tribe in Sībawayhi's region. Suppressing the recoverable word 'group' is made by analogy with suppression of the word 'tribe' when talking about Tamīm.[6]

In spite of some clear signs of erosion in tribal ties—as exemplified in a verse by the poet Nahār b. Tawsiʿa al-Yaškurī (d. 85/704),[7] quoted by Sībawayhi: أبي ألاسلام لا أب لي سواه اذا افتخروا بقيس أو تميم 'My father is Islam, I have no other. Let others boast with Qays or Tamīm'[8]—utterances like بنا تميم يكشف الضباب 'By us Tamīm, the fog is dispersed',[9] يا تميم كلكم ويا قيس كلكم 'O Tamīm, all of you, and O Qays, all of you'[10] or أتميما مرة وقيسيا مرة أخرى 'Are you a Tamīmī on one occasion and a Qaysī on another?'[11] exemplify a social trend where the long-standing rivalry between two powerful Arab tribes did not diminish in intensity and was still reflected

4 For a full list of the tribes mentioned in the *Kitāb*, see G. Troupeau, *Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1976), 244–5.

5 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 304, (1) ed. H. Derenbourg (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9) 2, 24–27, (2) ed. Būlāq (1898–1900 [repr. Baghdad, 1965]) 2, 25–28.

6 The aim of ellipsis in language is brevity and economy of speech, but it can only occur when the speaker is certain that the listener is able to recover the full meaning of the utterance and the omitted words.

7 Nahār b. Tawsiʿa, a poet of the tribe Taym Allāh (part of the Bakr b. Wāʾil) has been called the best poet of the Bakr in Ḫurāsān. See G.L. Della Vida, "Taym Allāh b. Ṯhaʿlaba", in *EI*² online.

8 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 176, Derenbourg 1, 304/Būlāq 1, 348.

9 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 162, Derenbourg1, 285/Būlāq 1, 327.

10 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 146, Derenbourg 1, 263/Būlāq 1, 304.

11 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 72, Derenbourg 1, 144/Būlāq 1, 172.

in some people's tendency to change allegiance according to a tribe's position and power within the new political and religious order.

Let us now bring into the discussion the cosmopolitan nature of the ʿAbbasid society, where non-Arab Muslims and non-Muslims dominated cultural activity, which was both rich and varied. Although the ʿAbbasid state was essentially a more pronounced Muslim state, the administrative and intellectual elite and a large proportion of the rank and file were not only non-Arab, but also non-Muslim. Many aspects of these manifold cultural activities and social realities are reflected in the *Kitāb*, from which some understanding of how Sībawayhi approaches onomastics ought to emerge.[12]

We may as well say something about the general attitude of the Muslim Arabs at this period of uninterest in various fields of Islamic studies and Arabic language in particular. Part of the reason for this might be the fact that for true Arabs pre-Islamic poetry was the only science that was worth knowing, imitating and transmitting.[13] Goldziher quotes a story about a Qurayšite exclaiming, on noticing an Arab child studying *Kitāb Sībawayhi*: "Bah! this is the science of school-teachers and the pride of beggars".[14]

2. Sībawayhian Grammar of Names: A Preliminary Outline

The uniqueness of proper names resides in their function of denoting individual entities endowed with their own referential character. The proper name, as its name implies, has the function of identifying a person being talked about within a specific spatiotemporal context of a speech act.[15]

In line with what is universally assumed, Sībawayhi considered proper names as a subcategory of noun. That is why he dedicates lengthy chapters to clarifying, analysing and debating their definiteness and identifi-

[12] Cf. the hemistichs referring to the Jews, the ever-burning fire the Magians worshipped, Christians' abstinence from food and drink during their fasting period just before Easter and the way they kneel and pray (Sībawayhi *Kitāb* chapter 305, Derenbourg 2, 27/ Būlāq 2, 29).

[13] One instance in the *Kitāb,* where this attitude and the primacy of poetry are reflected, may be Sībawayh's admission at the end of one of his chapters that the linguistic problem he had been discussing hardly arises anywhere in poetry and counts for little in the speech of the Arabs: وذلك ليس في شيء من كلامهم ولا يكاد يكون في شعر (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 21, Derenbourg 1, 28/Būlāq 1, 37).

[14] I. Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*. (Edited by S.M. Stern; translated by C.R. Barber and S.M. Stern; with a major new introduction by H, Dabashi. London, New Brunswick N.J.: Aldine Transactions, 2006), 105–6.

[15] cf. J. Lyons, *Semantics*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 637.

ability, the range of their inflection, patterns, shortening and lengthening, their function and number, and of course their particular gender. Here we have another fine example of subtle and serious analysis, which is the hallmark of the *Kitāb*, but not without its challenges. A comprehensive study of the general principles of the theory of names in the *Kitāb* goes far beyond the limits of this short paper;[16] but, if I highlight some basic assumptions on which this theory is built, that should help us to come closer to Sībawayhi's purpose. In doing so, I am obliged to gloss over a number of relevant issues, difficulties and complications that a more comprehensive discussion of the topic would require. What is of concern to us here is to focus on the importance of the grammar of names, as a linguistic area to which, in its various aspects with their underlying extra-linguistic context, Sībawayhi considered it worth dedicating hundreds of pages in his work.

In this next short passage, Sībawayhi offers an explicit account of the essence of the grammar of names as he envisaged it. He draws a clear semantic line between common and proper nouns:[17]

اذا قلت هذا الرجل فقد يكون أن تعني كماله ويكون ان تقول هذا الرجل وان تريد كل ذكر تكلم ومشى على رجلين فهو رجل فإذا أراد أن يخلّص ذلك المعنى ويختصه ليعرف من تعنى بعينه وأمره قال زيد ونحوه.

> If you say 'This [is] the man' you may intend his bodily vigour, and you may also say 'This [is] the man' intending that every male who speaks and walks on two legs is a man, but if you want to render the meaning clear and specific so that one may know who you are exactly identifying and referring to, in that case you say Zayd and the like.

The semantic information used to communicate the different meanings intended by the speaker supports the view that, even though most proper names lack lexical meaning,[18] they nevertheless are meaningful

---

[16] The amount of syntactical as well as morphological data on onomastics scattered through the two volumes of the *Kitāb* will prove any such attempt futile; as Carter puts it, "Clearly it was Sībawayhi's intention to identify and classify every known kind of word in Arabic, and history has confirmed that later scholars were able to add very little to the enormous treasury of word patterns in the *Kitāb*". He adds that the 10th-century Arab linguist al-Zubaydī managed to find only some eighty words missing from the *Kitāb* (M.G. *Carter, Sībawayhi*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 100.

[17] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 122, Derenbourg 1, 225/Būlāq 1, 263.

[18] Any attempt to summarize or discuss theories of name and reference in general linguistics will lead us too far afield. Without going into detail, it suffices to adopt Katz's method in grouping these theories into what he calls the classical theory, represented by Frege, Church and Searle, and the casual theory of Kirpke and Donnellan. The classical

and therefore cannot be considered as being completely empty of referential content. It is essential to our understanding of this particular area of grammar in the *Kitāb* to remind ourselves of one distinctive and indispensable feature of proper nouns, namely the fact that they are definite in themselves and not by virtue of any definiteness marker. In other words, their definiteness cannot be ascribed to the lack or presence of definiteness marker:

> فأما العلامة اللازمة المختصة فنحو زيد وعمرو وعبد الله وما أشبه ذلك وإنما صار معرفة لأنه أسم وقع عليه يعرف به بعينه دون سائر أمته.[19]
>
> As for the specific pertinacious marker [*sic.* of definiteness], instances are Zayd, ʿAmr, ʿAbdullāhi or the like. They are considered definite because they are names allotted to the person, by which he is known concretely and exclusively to everyone else in his group.

> إذا قلت هذا زيد فزيد أسم لمعنى قولك هذا الرجل إذا أردت شيأ بعينه قد عرفه المخاطب بحليته أو بأمر قد بلغه قد أختص به دون من يعرف . . . وأنما منع الاسد وما أشبهه أن يكون له أسم معناه معنى زيد أن الأسد وما أشبهها ليست بأشياء ثابتة مقيمة مع الناس فيحتاجوا الى أسماء يعرفون بها بعضها من بعض.[20]
>
> If you say ‘This is Zayd’, Zayd then is a meaningful noun equivalent to ‘This is the man’ whereby the listener knows the individual either in himself or by means of some specific information he has acquired about him and which distinguishes him from any other person the speaker may know…What prevents the ‘lion’ and the like from being a noun with a meaning similar to Zayd’s is that the ‘lion’ and the like are not permanent entities living with people so that they need nouns by which they are distinguished from each other.[21]

---

theory is Aristotelian and is based on a mental link between a set of properties and a name, a process that allows us to identify the object as having each of these properties and to name the object as the result of this identification. The central feature of casual theory, however, is that identification is based on historical and casual events, rather than meaning, and that naming an object is dependent on its casual relation to some sort of baptismal ceremony in which the name becomes the name of the referent (J. J. Katz, “A proper theory of names”. *Philosophical Studies*. An International Journal for Philosophy in Tradition, 31:1 (1977): 1). For a more detailed philosophical survey of names and reference theories, see Katz (ibid.) and Van W. Langendonck, “Remarks on some theories of names in the Handbook for Name Studie. Review article of Name Studies I.” *Onoma*, 32 (1995) and *Theory and Typology of Proper Names* (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs No. 168. The Hague: Mouten de Gruyter. 2007), 20–65.

19 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 104, Derenbourg 1, 187/ Būlāq 1, 219.

20 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 122, Derenbourg 1, 224–5/ Būlāq 1, 263–4.

21 Cf. Van Langendonck, *Proper Names*, 201, where he refers to the interesting parallelism between naming humans and breed animals. In this respect, he mentions a paper by Dobing-Jülch on breed animals’ names (ibid.).

At this level of generality, it will be evident to anyone who looks at the detailed account of definiteness of proper names in the *Kitāb* that uniqueness of reference, as an idiosyncratic feature of proper names, is contingent on context. Pragmatically speaking, Sībawayhi points to 'social deixis' and the related functions of identification and location as the main reason for people's giving and using proper nouns. This function of identification and location represents the main aspect of the analytical model of onomastics developed in the *Kitāb*, for identification requires closeness of entities and appropriated personal features which are assumed to be common ground in the knowledge of both speaker and listener, and exclusive of any other member of the class. The component of location involves spatiotemporal proximity, and thus acquaintance, as an indispensable deictic element. The logical conclusion to be drawn here is that proper nouns are not known by the speaker and listener in an all-or-nothing way, and that the way whereby proper nouns are known is threefold: by acquaintance, by introduction and by description.[22]

Sībawayhi's account of proper names can be fruitfully summarised and made more accessible to linguists by means of the three roles of proper names identified by Anderson: the roles of identification, nomination and address/vocative.[23] To put it another way, naming a person is a linguistic process whereby someone is either spoken of or spoken to. The role of identification involves both common knowledge of, or acquaintance with the individual named by the speaker and listener, and the deictic element of location which identifies the individual within the immediate non-linguistic context. The role of nomination, on the other hand, helps us grasp Sībawayhi's observation about the indefiniteness of the dual and plural forms of proper names, for, as Anderson rightly points out, names assigned by nomination do not usually exhibit unique features and they are generally chosen out of a common stock. In spite of them being indefinite, a primary identification in context of the individuals sharing the same name is attained, but it remains an identification independent of its derivative context. Finally, vocative names in the *Kitāb*[24] are another area whose full extent is awaiting further exploration, but it suffices to

[22] Admittedly, Sībawayhi does not use equivalent terminology to qualify the process of knowledge in proper names, but he nevertheless describes these three ways of onomastic knowledge consistently, repeatedly and clearly (see for instance, Sībawayhi *Kitāb*, chapter 117; 122; 147–8, Derenbourg 1, 218–19/Būlāq 1, 257/; Derenbourg 1, 224–5/ Būlāq 1, 263; Derenbourg 1, 265ff/ Būlāq 1, 306ff respectively).

[23] Anderson, *Grammar of Names*, 215–222.

[24] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 103, Derenbourg 1, 262ff/Būlāq 1, 303ff.

mention here that vocatives cannot be classified as simple names for "vocatives are not simply nominals of whatever kind; they must be represented as speech acts, and this is part of their lexically derived structure".[25]

As far as simple utterances—such as هذا زيد 'This is Zayd' and هذا عبد الله 'This is 'Abdullāhi'—are concerned, we are told that Zayd and 'Abdullāhi are meaningful nouns that may refer to a specific individual, known to both the speaker and listener by acquaintance. However, the same utterances may be the result of the speaker's introducing Zayd to the listener; Zayd would therefore be unknown to the listener prior to the introduction event, in which case the speaker might resort to the common strategy of attributive description, whereby a referential link is established with a personal acquaintance or historical personality.[26] This is exactly what Sībawayhi is referring to when stating that the speaker has the option to qualify 'Zayd' in 'This is Zayd' either adjectively or not: ولو قلت هذا زيد كنت في الصفة بالخيار ان شئت وصفت وان شئت لم تصف.[27]

Proper nouns may thus be qualified adjectively—as in مررت بزيد الطويل 'I passed by the tall Zayd' or مررت بزيد هذا وبعمرو ذاك 'I passed by this Zayd and that 'Amr', or مررت بزيد أخيك 'I passed by Zayd, your brother'.[28] In مررت بزيد الطويل 'I passed by the tall Zayd', the adjective 'tall' is required to make Zayd better known and focus the listener's attention on him. However, the proper noun 'Zayd' in مررت بأخيك زيد 'I passed by your brother, Zayd' does not fulfil the role of an adjectival qualifier because it lacks a lexical meaning, but instead its specific content and referential character (i.e. its meaningfulness) reveal further the identity of 'your brother' within an apposition structure.[29] This is the reason why an instance like

---

[25] Anderson, *Grammar of Names*, 222.

[26] See the general discussion in Van Langendonck, *Proper Names*, 91, where he refers to a similar phenomenon that occurs in the European languages he is discussing. See also Sīrafī's (p. 146b) comment on chapter 88 (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, Derenbourg 1, 159/ Būlāq 1, 189) where he mentions that the equational sentence 'This is 'Abdullāhi' may be fully self-sufficient as an utterance or may need further qualification to remove any doubt regarding 'Abdullāhi's identity—اذا قلت هذا عبد الله جاز ان يكون كلامك قد جرى على يقين منك وتحقيق وجاز ان يكون على شك—but note the difference from هذا عبد الله منطلقا 'This is 'Abdullāhi departing' where 'departing' is intended to draw the listener's attention to 'Abdullāhi's state of departing and certainly not to identifying him further (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 117, Derenbourg 1, 218/ Būlāq 1, 256).

[27] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 157, Derenbourg 1, 281/ Būlāq 1, 323.

[28] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 104, Derenbourg 1, 188/ Būlāq 1, 220.

[29] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 148, Derenbourg 1, 267–8// Būlāq 1, 309). Cf. also Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 115, Derenbourg 1, 215/ Būlāq 1, 252 where Sībawayhi points out that Zayd in مررت برجل زيد 'I passed by a man, Zayd' is possible, because the speaker evaluates the

هذا عبد الله كل الرجل 'This is ʿAbdullāhi who excels in perfection' is not considered an example of good Arabic because ʿAbdullāhi is already identifiable by the listener beyond any doubt.[30]

What Sībawayhi intends when qualifying a proper name as describable is that it no longer falls within the remit of identification and recognition by acquaintance. The deictic element of identification and location is lacking and its role of performative nomination and recognition by description is fully assumed. In other words, the entity cannot be identified by reference to the immediate context of speech but only by means of 'reference-fixing description' where the expression of the name's definiteness is not assumed.[31]

An important formal reflection of the pragmatic-semantic characterization of proper names is thus their ability to display grammatical features exhibited by other nouns, such as definiteness, case assignment, gender and number. The correlation between number and definiteness in proper nouns is complex but it will prove highly beneficial for tracing some of the patterns that run through the grammar of names as a whole, and reflect the way proper names fulfil their roles and convey the meaning related to each role. The features we are going to consider in what follows are features that should help us to identify where definiteness and number of proper nouns interact with one another.

On the basis of the distinction Sībawahyi draws between the definite interpretation of singular proper names and the indefinite interpretation of their dual/plural form in utterances, there is one point that can be usefully made before we proceed. In هذان زيدان منطلقان وهذان عمران منطلقان 'These are two departing Zayds and these are two departing ʿAmrs', the dual forms of Zayd and ʿAmr are qualified as 'unknown or indefinite' لم يكن هذا الكلام إلا نكرة and this relates to one of the different roles that may be assumed by proper names in various speech contexts, raised by Sībawahyi in the chapters dealing with definiteness and proper nouns in general and those dealing with the dual and plural forms of proper nouns in particular.[32] The fact that more than one Zayd or ʿAmr is referred to in the utterance above is enough to deprive these proper nouns of their unique appropriated qualities, which makes it possible for the listener to

---

mental state of the listener and puts him in the status of someone who asks 'Who is he?' even if he does not actually say so.

30 Sībawayhi *Kitāb* chapter 104, Derenbourg 1, 190–1/ Būlāq 1, 223.

31 Cf. Anderson, *Grammar of Names*, 217.

32 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 123, Derenbourg 1, 228–9/ Būlāq 1, 268.

identify the two Zayds or the two ʿAmrs. The dual (and indeed plural) forms of proper names in Arabic cease to be a means of identification and assume the function of performative nomination. Here, the core component of proper names is lacking, that is "the association of names with fixed referential indices, so that each name-index configuration is unique, enabling identification".[33]

A final point that deserves comment, one where the *Kitāb*'s contribution to the grammar of proper names becomes apparent, is Sībawahyi's remark that toponyms, unlike anthroponyms, retain their identificatory character when they have the dual or plural form. The permanent and immobile character shared by mountain ranges or other geographical features means that they are considered a single entity. 'The Himalayas', for instance, does not refer to the sum total of single Himalaya mountains, and nor will anyone say that they passed by a Himalaya mountain, for the name 'The Himalayas' is applied to the whole range of mountains covered by that name. This is precisely the argument Sībawayhi applies to the two mountain tops referred to collectively as *ʾAbānayn* (lit. the two *ʾAbāns*). The argument is reiterated in the *Kitāb* when Sībawahyi indicates the impossibility of the name *ʾAbānayn* referring to one mountain top to the exclusion of the other. Conversely, it is possible to refer to one of two or more mobile humans or beasts of burden in the absence of one or other member(s) of the group sharing the same name.[34]

Sībawayhi's remarkable achievement in this particular area of grammar manifests itself in his ability to establish a sound approach to onomastics by using a large corpus of naturally occurring data; he manages quite smoothly to show how the formal and functional components of language correlate and integrate.

3. Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāhi in the *Kitāb*

Putting together the various elements discussed so far, we are now ready to formulate a tentative hypothesis as to why names such as Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāhi are found on nearly every page of the *Kitāb*, whereas other names we would expect to see, such as Moḥammad and Aḥmad, are conspicuously absent or recede into the background in the first extant Arabic grammar.

[33] Anderson, *Grammar of Names*, 223.
[34] cf. Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 123, Derenbourg 1, 229/ Būlāq 1, 268.

I have deliberately not divided the discussion below into linguistic and extra-linguistic, because this section forms a single argument and both aspects are equally relevant throughout. In the *Kitāb*, linguistic and extra-linguistic elements are interconnected and shade into one another in such a way that one element does not distract us from the other. On the contrary, the two fuse smoothly and naturally into a cogent argument that combines the two elements to create a holistic view of what language is all about. This is clearly reflected in Sībawayhi's treatment of proper names that are discussed and richly exemplified, from many points of view, not only in the chapters devoted to Arabic proper names, surnames and nicknames but also in the various chapters dealing with Persian, Jewish, Christian or even pagan Arab and non-Arab names.[35]

Sībawayhi states time and again that Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāhi are the predominant Arabic names.[36] An important reference to the status of Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāhi comes in the chapter dealing with *al-tarḫīm* 'shortening in vocative':[37]

واعلم انه ليس من اسم لا تكون في اخره هاء يُحذف منه شيء اذا لم يكن اسمًا غالبًا نحو زيد وعمرو من قبل ان المعارف الغالبة اكثر في الكلام وهم لها اكثر استعمالا.[38]

> You should know that no noun without a final *hāʾ* can have parts of it deleted unless it is a predominant name such as Zayd and ʿAmr; this is because popular names occur more often in speech and people use them more widely.

The most important question that must be raised regarding the status of Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāhi as prototypical names is Tamīm's role in the *Kitāb*. In what follows I present crucial tribal and genealogical factors as the key to understanding this. My historical arguments and quotations

---

35 ʿAbd Šams 'The Sun-worshipper', for instance, occurs in the chapter discussing annexation of a name to another definite name, but in this case *Šams* 'the Sun' is definite by itself and not by virtue of the definite article ʾal (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 313, Derenbourg 2, 45–6/Būlāq 2, 49; for further discussion see Marogy, *Syntax and Pragmatics*, 109–11). The celebrated Mār Sargis (St Sergius), whose cult was widespread among Arab tribes and whose shrine was a great centre of pilgrimage, is also mentioned in the chapter dealing with nicknames (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 314, Derenbourg 2, 46/Būlāq 2, 49–50).

36 Cf. for instance *Kitāb* chapter 148, Derenbourg 268/Būlāq 1, 309, where Sībawayhi repeats twice that these three names are the most common Arabic names.

37 *al-Tarḫīm* is a linguistic phenomenon where a common anthroponym is abbreviated by eliding its final letters to facilitate its pronunciation, as in *Ḥār* for Ḥārith and *ṣāḥ* in the vocative expression *yā ṣāḥ* for *yā ṣāḥib* 'O companion'. The frequent occurrence of these words in speech is the condition *sine qua non* for their eligibility to undergo *al-tarḫīm* (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 103, Derenbourg 1, 293/Būlāq 1, 290).

38 Ibid.

below, unless otherwise indicated, are based on Lecker's article on the tribe of Tamīm b. Murr[39] because it succinctly contains all the basic socio-historical data needed to support the hypothesis advanced in this paper.

Tamīm's weight in the tribal population of Iraq is concomitant with the weight given to their authoritative eastern variant of Arabic, which formed the core of the classical language and a great deal of the *Kitāb*'s linguistic data. In spite of Sībawayhi's reference to the Ḥijazī variant as 'good old Arabic', the Tamīmī dialect was "the actual model for the practical form of the language Sībawayhi sought to define".[40]

The tribe of Tamīm was divided into three main subgroups whose eponymous ancestors were the three sons of Tamīm, namely Zayd Manāt,[41] ʿAmr and Ḥāriṯ. Their descendants in their turn became the eponymous ancestors of many other Arabic tribes. The children of Saʿd b. Zayd Manāt, except Kaʿb and ʿAmr, formed a group called *al-ʾabnāʾ*.[42] Except for two of Kaʿb's sons, ʿAmr and ʿAwf, the rest of his sons were called *al-ʾajārib* 'the scabby ones'.[43] The main group in the Mālik b. Zayd Manāt subdivision was the Ḥanẓala b. Mālik, among whom the Dārim b. Mālik, or rather the ʿAbdullāhi b. Dārim was the dominant group, if not the most important in the whole tribe of Tamīm.[44] The dominant line among the ʿAbdullāhi b. Dārim was Zayd b. ʿAbdullāhi. As for the ʿAmr b. Tamīm branch, the area of ʿAbbādān near Baṣra was called after one of his descendants. The least important branch of Tamīm was Ḥāriṯ b. Tamīm.

Even a cursory examination of the onomasticon of the tribe and its branches suggests that a case can be made for a clear and predominant influence of the Tamīm in the area of morphology in the *Kitāb*. Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāhi are not common in the broad sense of the word; their predominance reflects their correlation with ancestral eponyms of the most powerful branches of Tamīm. When dealing with shortening in the voca-

[39] M. Lecker, "Tamīm b. Murr (or Tamīm bt. Murr, when the tribe orḳabīla is referred to)," in *EI*² online.

[40] Carter, *Sībawayhi*, 41.

[41] It may or may not be a coincidence that Zayd and Zayd Manāt are mentioned in connection with a question about the noblest people, in the chapter dealing with the interrogative particle *ʾayy* 'which' (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 222, Derenbourg 1, 350/ Būlāq 1, 397).

[42] A clear reference to *al-abnāʾ* or sons of Saʿd is made in the chapter dealing the annexation of *yāʾ al-nisba* to plural nouns (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 103, Derenbourg 2, 87/ Būlāq 2, 89).

[43] Another clear reference to the sons of *al-ʾajrab* is found in the *Kitāb* (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 350, Derenbourg 2, 96/ Būlāq 2, 98).

[44] Cf. the panegyric verses in praise of some branches of Tamīm and a satirical verse taunting the tribe of Kaʿb b. Rabīa b.ʿĀmir in the chapter dealing with plural masculine and feminine names (Ibid., Derenbourg 2, 95/ Būlāq 2, 96–7).

tive and the necessary condition of frequency in speech, Sībawayhi clearly states that Ḥāriṯ, Mālik and ʿĀmir are names frequently used in poetry and given to men—وليس الحذف لشيء من هذه الأسماء ألزم منه لحارث ومالك وعامر وذلك لأنهم استعملوها كثيرا في الشعر وأكثروا التسمية بها للرجال[45]—but the low profile of Ḥāriṯ b. Tamīm within the tribe may explain why it is not as frequently used by Sībawayhi even though he affirms that Ḥāriṯ is as common as Zayd.[46] What is crucial about these names is that they throw much light on Sībawayhi's circle of informants and the milieu in which he worked and moved.[47]

Further support is gained from the fact that there is a certain amount of empirical evidence to suggest that names like Muḥammad and Aḥmad were not very popular in the pre-Islamic or early Islamic period. There is perhaps stronger empirical evidence to support the view that there was hardly any Muslim child called Aḥmad after the founder of Islam before the year 125/742, while there is evidence that children received the name of Muḥammad.[48] It is not as if any religious reference to Muḥammad as the founder of Islam is completely absent from the *Kitāb*, for I am aware of two verses quoted in the *Kitāb* where the name of the founder of Islam occurs.[49]

The solid spot in this argument is not only the obvious predominance of the eponyms Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāhi, but also the geographical distribution of large Tamīmī groups in both garrison cities of Baṣra and Kūfa that are described as the "extensions of Tamīm's Arabian territories. The Tamīmīs in Baṣra belonged to the Saʿd, the Ḥanẓala and the ʿAmr; members of the same groups were among the early settlers in Kūfa as well."[50] However, the most tantalising and possibly the most significant argument here is the fact that "[m]any Tamīmīs settled in the regions of Persia conquered by Baṣran and Kūfan troops".[51]

The discussion so far nicely dovetails with Tamīm's pre-Islamic relationship with the Sāsānids, al-Ḥīra and with Mecca. The Tamīm and other

---

45 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 166, Derenbourg 1, 291/ Būlāq 1, 335.

46 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 350, Derenbourg 2, 99/ Būlāq 2, 101.

47 One of the instances that show Sībawayhi's direct interaction with the Tamīmīs is when he explicitly mentions that he asked the Tamīmīs about the definiteness of some spatial qualifiers (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 311, Derenbourg 2, 43/ Būlāq 2, 47).

48 W.M. Watt, "His name is Aḥmad," in *Early Islam: Collected Articles*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, (April) 1953), 43–4.

49 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 103, Derenbourg 1, 230/Būlāq 1, 269 and Derenbourg 1, 363/ Būlāq 1, 408.

50 Lecker, "Tamīm b. Murr," in *EI*[2] online.

51 Ibid.

Arab tribes were part of the king of al-Ḥīra's network of allies in the institution of *ridāfa* or viceroyship, a measure to keep troublesome tribesmen and Bedouins under control and secure the safety of the Sāsānid[52] and Ḥīran trade caravans. The Tamīmī clan of the Banū Ayyūb, whose most prominent member was the poet ʿAdī b. Zayd,[53] was quite influential in al-Ḥīra and had very close ties with the Sāsānid court. References made to the *Abnāʾ Fārs*, the *ʿAbādīd*, the *Anbāṭ*[54] and the *Manāḏira*[55] may be considered significant pointers to Tamīm's socio-political and religious world.[56]

Conclusion

My main purpose in this brief account has been to emphasise the theoretical importance of the grammar of names in the *Kitāb* and the importance of the linguistic and extra-linguistic elements and their interconnectedness and mutual interdependence. Complementarity of approach has been reaffirmed yet again as the hallmark of the *Kitāb*.

Although this discussion has been of a preliminary character, it has nevertheless drawn attention to a neglected area in the *Kitāb* and most probably in Arab linguistics. Sībawayhi's approach stands out again not only for the quality of his arguments, which remain consistently solid, but also for the numerous contemporaneous examples that sufficiently supplement and illustrate his views and add a unique socio-historical value to them. Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāhi have been the window through which we have managed to take a unique glimpse into the grammar of names and the influence of the well-known Arab tribal group Tamīm, both socio-politically and linguistically. In addition to the valuable data associated with Zayd, ʿAmr and ʿAbdullāh, the *Kitāb* can be claimed to have immortalised the Tamīmī's eponyms.

---

52 According to Lecker, Hajar was an important venue of Tamīmī-Persian co-operation (ibid.).

53 Note that the poet's son was named ʿAmr. Zayd and ʿAmr were also the names of ʿAdī b. Zayd's brothers who were claimed to be among the notable Ḥīrīs who went to meet the leader of the Muslim army that besieged al-Ḥīra (F.M. Donner, *The Early Islamic Conquests*. ACLS Humanities E-Book. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1981: 183; 331 n. 85).

54 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 339, Derenbourg 2, 86/Būlāq 2, 88–9.

55 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 350, Derenbourg 2, 97/Būlāq 2, 98.

56 See M.J. Kister, "Mecca and Tamīm: aspects of their tribal relations," Journal *of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 8 (1965) and "Al-Ḥīra: some notes on its relations with Arabia," *Arabica*, 15 (1968), 169.

The dialogue between the *Kitāb* and general linguistics has proved fruitful, but this dialogue is meant to be a real encounter so as to prevent the dialogue from degenerating into a monologue. In other words, the *Kitāb* is not meant to be constantly on the receiving end. Sībawayhi's comprehensive and detailed study of proper names, probably more than any other area of grammar and linguistics covered by the *Kitāb*, will bring considerable benefits and invaluable insights to this area of linguistic research. We have seen that there is a distinguishable and highly developed grammar of names in the *Kitāb*, which can offer general linguistics some basic but indispensable tools and analytical strategies.

The following words express the spirit that guided the writing of this paper and they can fittingly bring it to a conclusion:

> Names are obviously not sufficient to make a linguistic system, but they are necessary: name-free full linguistic communication is not an option. And, as the range of concerns we have surveyed testifies to, having a name remains perhaps the most mysteriously and fascinatingly human manifestation of language.[57]

References

Primary Sources

Sībawayhi, ʿAmr ibn ʿUṯmān. *Kitāb*, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Edited by H. Derenbourg. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag 1970), (2) ed. Būlāq, 1898–1900 (repr. Baghdad, 1965).

al-Sīrāfī, Abū Saʿīd. *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi.* photo of MS Atef Efendi 2548.

Secondary Sources

Anderson, J.M. *The Grammar of Names*. Oxford Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Carter, M.G. *Sībawayhi*. Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies. London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2004.

Della Vida, G.L. "Taym Allāh b. Ṯhaʿlaba," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *Second Edition*, edited by P. Bearman, T. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs. Leiden: Brill, 2011. Brill Online. University of Cambridge. Accessed on 04 January 2011. http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/uid=1368/entry?entry=islam_SIM-7468

Donner, F.M. *The Early Islamic Conquests*. ACLS Humanities E-Book. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Goldziher, I. *Muslim Studies*. Edited by S.M. Stern; translated by C.R. Barber and S.M. Stern; with a major new introduction by Hamid Dabashi. London, New Brunswick NJ: Aldine Transactions, 2006.

Katz, J.J. "A proper theory of names." *Philosophical Studies*. An International Journal for Philosophy in Tradition, 31:1 (1977): 1–80.

57 Anderson, *Grammar of Names*, 333.

Kister, M.J. "Mecca and Tamīm: aspects of their tribal relations." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 8 (1965): 63–113 (repr. in his Studies in Jāhiliyya and Early Islam, No. I, London: Variorum, 1980).

——, "Al-Ḥīra: some notes on its relations with Arabia." *Arabica*, 15 (1968): 143–169 (repr. in his Studies in Jāhiliyya and early Islam, No. III, London: Variorum, 1980).

Lecker, M. "Tamīm b. Murr (or Tamīm bt. Murr, when the tribe orḳabīla is referred to)." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, edited by P. Bearman, T. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs. Leiden: Brill, 2011. Brill Online. University of Cambridge. Accessed on 04 January 2011. http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=islam_COM-1165

Lyons, J. *Semantics*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Marogy, A.E. *Kitāb Sībawayhi: Syntax and Pragmatics*. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics No. 56, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010.

Troupeau, G. *Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1976.

Van Langendonck, W. "Remarks on some theories of names in the Handbook for Name Studies. Review article of Name Studies I." *Onoma*, 32 (1995): 157–170.

——, *Theory and Typology of Proper Names*. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs No. 168. The Hague: Mouten de Gruyter, 2007.

Watt, W.M. "His name is Aḥmad." In *Early Islam: Collected Articles*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, April 1953, 43–50.

YAQUM VS *QĀMA* IN THE CONDITIONAL CONTEXT: A RELATIVISTIC INTERPRETATION OF THE FRONTIER BETWEEN THE PREFIXED AND THE SUFFIXED CONJUGATIONS OF THE ARABIC LANGUAGE

Manuela E.B. Giolfo

Introduction: From Syntax to Semantics

This article is based on an investigation which we have been conducting on the meaning of conditionality in the earliest Arab grammatical theory and on how that meaning is reflected in syntax.[1] Our investigation started by analysing how earliest Arab grammatical theory[2] and European grammars[3] treat conditional systems of the Arabic language.

The analysis was at first led by a syntactic consideration of the conditional sentence, in the attempt to answer the following questions: Which

[1] M.E.B. Giolfo, "Le strutture condizionali dell'arabo classico nella tradizione grammaticale araba e nella tradizione grammaticale europea", *Kervan—International Journal of Afro-Asiatic Studies*, Universities of Turin and Enna—2 (2005), 55–79, www.kervan.unito.it; *idem*, "I sistemi condizionali in *in* dell'arabo classico: *in yafʿal vs in faʿala*, un'ipotesi modale" (paper presented at the 12th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics, University of Ragusa, Italy, June 6–9, 2005), in *Atti del XII Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camito-semitica* (*Afroasiatica*), ed. M. Moriggi (Catanzaro: Rubbettino, 2006), 185–192; *idem*, "*in yaqum vs in qāma*: un'ipotesi modale," *Kervan—International Journal of Afro-Asiatic Studies*, Universities of Turin and Enna—3 (2006), 17–34, www.kervan.unito.it.

[2] Sībawayhi, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Edited by H. Derenbourg. (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9 [repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag 1970]), (2) edited by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn (Cairo: Dār al-Qalam, 1966–1977); Ibn Jinnī, *Kitāb al-lumaʿ fī al-naḥw*, ed. H.M. Kechrida (Uppsala: 1976); Zamaḫšarī, *Kitāb al-mufaṣṣal fī al-naḥw*, ed. J.P. Broch (Christianiae, 1859); Zamaḫšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī ʿilm al-ʿarabiyya* (Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, n.d.); Ibn al-Ḥājib, *Kāfiya*, *via* Raḍī al-dīn al-Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ Kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥājib* (Istanbul: Maṭbaʿat al-šarika al-ṣiḥāfiyya al-ʿuṯmāniyya, 1275 and 1310 H, [rept. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, n.d.]; Ibn al-Ḥājib, *Kāfiya*, *via* Molla Jāmī, *al-Fawāʾid al-ḍiyāʾiyya, Molla Jāmī ʿalā al-Kāfiya* (Istanbul: n.d.); Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ ʿalā al-alfiyya* (Cairo: 1965); Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ Ibn ʿAqīl ilā Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*, ed. Ṭ.M. al-Zaynī (Cairo: ʾĪsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1966–1967).

[3] W. Wright, *A grammar of the Arabic language, translated from the German of Caspari, and edited with numerous additions and corrections*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896–98 [1st ed. 1859–1862; repr. Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1974, 2 vols. in 1, revised by W.R. Smith and M.J. de Goeje; preface, addenda and corrigenda by P. Cachia]; L. Veccia Vaglieri, *Grammatica teorico-pratica della lingua araba* (Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente, 1937); R. Blachère and M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *Grammaire de l'arabe classique* (*morphologie et syntaxe*), 3e édition revue et remaniée (Paris: G.P. Maisonneuve et Larose, 1952); W. Fischer, *Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1972; F. Corriente, *Gramática árabe*, Madrid: Instituto Hispano Arabe de Cultura, 1980).

particles[4] introduce the conditional sentence? Which verbal forms occur in conditional sentences? Which verbal forms are correlated to a specific conditional particle? These questions necessarily bring to other subsequent interrogatives, which make clear that syntax and semantics are intrinsically tied, and that the first is subordinated to the latter: Which conditional particle is to be used in this or in that case? Which is the typical verbal form associated with a certain conditional particle? Which set is originated by the different verbal forms which are used with the same conditional particle?

The first series of questions, being of empiric-formal nature, corresponds to the grammatical investigation for any specific language. The answers to these questions are provided by linguists, or rather by grammarians of that particular language. Questions of the second group cannot be answered without a prior investigation on meaning, that is to say without taking into account the conceptual values of the conditional structures in general, and after that the value of each conditional structure pertaining to a specific language. The second group of questions belongs to the field of logics and semantics, rather than to that of grammar. Nevertheless the grammatical analysis is never complete until the questions of the second group are answered, being these answers the only ones able to explain the results of the syntactic analysis. As a matter of fact, when analysing the conditional structures of the Arabic language, we are compelled to face problems of semantic nature, which are related to the way in which reality is reflected by each single clause of the conditional sentence, and tied to the type of relationship between the two components of a conditional sentence. The conceptual value of different conditional expressions can only be determined after an investigation on these aspects. We are convinced that it is up to the linguists to provide a linguistic answer on these logic-semantic questions.

[4] As far as the use of the term 'particle' is concerned, it descends from two reasons: on the one hand, the terminological choice of expressly avoiding the use of terms like 'conjunction', 'subordinate conjunction', 'subordinate operator', which could be misleading, as they would reflect the subordinate character of the protasis with respect to the apodosis when referring to the structure *in šarṭ jawāb al-šarṭ* "conditional particle-condition-answer to the condition"; on the other hand, it also descends from a wish of cautious assent to the neutral terminology of Arab grammarians. Furthermore, the term 'operator' should only be used after a clarification about the elements on which the conditional particles operate or, in other terms, whether they operate directly on the *šarṭ* "condition" and only indirectly on the *jawāb* "answer", or directly on both the *šarṭ* "condition" and the *jawāb* "answer".

1. The Arab Grammatical Tradition and the Relationship between Syntax and Semantics

Which kind of process was developed by the Arab grammatical tradition, with respect to the above fields (syntactic and semantic) and to their mutual relationships, in the investigation of the conditional structures? At a first glance, the study of conditionality does not seem to play an important role in the Arab grammatical tradition, as this was primarily concerned with the syntactic-formal aspects. Nevertheless, when getting closer to this problem, we realise that Sībawayhi and early Arab grammarians, though they do not treat the conditional sentence in its pure theoretical sense, refer to an indirect conceptualisation of conditionality, by means of attributing a prototypical character to particular conditional structures. In this respect, a deep difference has to be noticed between the approach of Sībawayhi (d.? 793) and that of any later Arab grammarians. Sībawayhi, in fact, tried to show the semantic-communicative values of formal linguistic structures, and this due to his conviction that any syntactic variation has its semantic counterpart. As Dévényi[5] remarks:

> Later grammarians, contrary to Sībawayhi, were not able and, 'frankly', did not want, to follow this method which demands great discipline and supposes an overall insight into the basic character of language. They inherited, of course, some general semantic principles (the communicative orientation of Arabic grammar had never ceased to be tangible) from 'great' generation of eighth-nine century linguists, but on the whole they were mainly interested in syntactic phenomena from normative and pedagogic points of view.

In our opinion, as far as this matter is concerned, it is in virtue of such a syntactic-semantic analysis, reaching the semantic definition of the concept of conditional sentence, that Sībawayhi's system of conditional structures—which actually contemplates only the structure of the type 'in apocopate, apocopate'—is minimally inclusive compared to later Arab grammarians. This appears to be due to his restrictive judgement, deriving from the selective view by which he evaluates different syntactic solutions on the basis of their semantic value. The semantic value of a specific conditional structure would be in this view checked against the semantic definition of the conditional expression. As a consequence, a certain number of particles are excluded from the set of conditional particles (namely the

[5] K. Dévényi, "The treatment of conditional sentences by mediaeval Arab grammarians. (Stability and change in the history of Arabic grammar.)," *The Arabist* (*Budapest Studies in Arabic*), 1 (1988), 12.

particle *iḏā* and the particle *law*), a certain number of syntactic structures introduced by particles not belonging to the set of conditional particles is excluded from the system of conditional structures, together with verbal forms other than the apocopate.

It has to be outlined that Sībawayhi's approach is not only due to his conception of language, but also to the subsequent conception of linguistics as a science able to describe the relationships between syntax and semantics. In fact, only such a conception of language and linguistics can justify the exclusion, from his system of conditional structures, of all structures other than '*in* apocopate, apocopate'. Conversely, the higher inclusiveness of the systems of conditional structures as contemplated by later Arab grammarians could be explained by the fact that, as reported by Dévényi,[6] they limited themselves to a merely formal treatment of the conditional structures, refraining, in their approach, from that deep comprehension which can reach to the essential character of linguistic expression. The higher inclusiveness of the systems of conditional structures by later Arab grammarians actually represents a loss in descriptive effectiveness and in 'normative' meaningfulness. Anyhow, despite the fact that Arab grammatical tradition is characterised, from a historical point of view, by a certain variability in the methods used when analysing linguistic data, there is a general agreement on the fact that the essence of the conditional sentences lays in their characteristic of uncertainty: uncertainty about the feasibility of the condition, and, as a consequence, uncertainty about the feasibility of the event subject to that condition.

The different evaluation of conditional sentences with respect to temporal sentences, arises from this very definition of the true conditional expression. As a consequence, an analysis is performed by Arab grammarians on conditions themselves, abstracting from their relation with the conditioned event, with the aim to distinguish conditions which are 'only possible' ('uncertain') from the 'certain' ones ('possible and necessary', or 'impossible').

2. Sībawayhi's Definition of the Conditional Expression

Sībawayhi clearly limits the field of conditional sentences to the case of 'only possible' conditions, that is to say that he limits the domain of conditional sentences to hypothetical sentences alone. He therefore judges that any sentences arising from a condition which is not 'uncertain' ('possible

[6] Ibid.

and non-necessary') should not be considered as a proper conditional sentence, being in fact non-hypothetical. This would be the case for those conditions which are introduced by the particle *iḏā*, and by the particle *law*. Sībawayhi's definition of the essence of the conditional expression is in fact as follows:

وسألته عن إذا، ما منعهم أن يجازوا بها؟[7] [. . .] إذا تجيء وقتا معلوما؛ ألا ترى أنك لو قلت: آتيك إذا احمر البسر[8] كان حسنا، ولو قلت: آتيك إن احمر البسر، كان قبيحا. فإن أبدا مبهمة،[9] وكذلك حروف الجزاء.[10]

> Then I asked him [al-Ḫalīl] why *iḏā* should not be employed as conditional particle. […] *Iḏā* occurs when there is temporal determination; can't you see that if you said: 'I'll come to you 'when' (*iḏā*) the dates, now unripe, will be mature' this would be a good expression, whilst in case you said: 'I'll come to you 'if' (*in*) the dates, now unripe, will be mature', this would be a bad expression?[11] In fact *in* is always uncertain, like all conditional particles.[12]

Such a definition—based on non-formal criteria—of *in* as proper conditional particle inasmuch as it is hypothetical, in opposition to the temporal character of *iḏā*, delimits the scope of conditional expression to hypothetical expressions alone.[13] This has its syntactic counterpart in the statement that: حروف الجزاء تَجزم الأفعال ويَنجزم الجوابُ بما قبله "Conditional particles operate the apocope of the verbs, being the apodosis apocopated by what precedes [i.e. protasis]".[14]

If Arab grammarians did not reach a direct description of the cases of the implication,[15] this, in our opinion, is not due to their unawareness of implication itself, and of its cases, i.e. the type of relation between the condition and the event subject to that condition. We think in fact

7 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 385/Hārūn 3, 56.

8 'Unripe dates' (*al-busru*).

9 'Uncertain' (*mubhama*).

10 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 384–9/Hārūn 3, 56–69.

11 It is important to notice here that آتيك إن احمر البسر "I'll come to you 'if' (*in*) the dates, now unripe, will be mature" would be a bad expression because of a twofold reason: *in* is always uncertain whilst *iḏā* occurs when there is temporal determination, and the semantic characteristic of uncertainty of the expression introduced by *in* is represented at the morpho-syntactic level by the fact that حروف الجزاء تَجزم الأفعال ويَنجزم الجوابُ بما قبله "Conditional particles operate the apocope of the verbs, being the apodosis apocopated by what precedes [i.e. protasis]" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 386/Hārūn 3, 62).

12 Whilst dates sooner or later do necessarily ripen! It's just a question of time.

13 For the particle *law*, see *infra*.

14 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 386/Hārūn 3, 62.

15 A. Kratzer, *Semantik der Rede, Kontexttheorie—Modalwörter—Konditionalsätze* (Scriptor, 1978); D.K. Lewis, *Counterfactuals* (Oxford: 1973).

that they did not provide such a direct definition only because the logic-semantic analysis is already implicit in Sībawayhi's hierarchy of conditional particles and associated verbal forms. The choice of the particle introducing the protasis, and of the verbal forms in the protasis and the apodosis is in fact based on semantic and non-formal criteria.

A confirmation of the 'possible and non-necessary' i.e. 'hypothetical' character of the condition is to be found in another passage of *al-Kitāb*, where Sībawayhi draws a parallel between interrogative, imperative, and conditional expressions.

The term which was most commonly used by Arab grammarians referring to the conditional sentence is *jazāʾ* "remuneration, compensation, reciprocation", whilst the 'conditional particles' (*ḥurūf al- jazāʾ*) are those which introduce a 'conditional sentence' (*mā yujāzā bi-hi*). In Sībawayhi's terminology the protasis is called *al-kalām al-awwal* "the first clause", while the apodosis is called *jawāb al-jazāʾ* "answer of the conditional expression" or, more simply, *jawāb* "answer".[16] The term *jazāʾ* became, in time, a term indicating the apodosis, sometimes referred to as *jawāb* and sometimes as *jazāʾ*[17] (though the two terms maintained, for some grammarians,[18] a certain distinctive meaning), while the protasis assumed the denomination of *šarṭ* "condition", this latter term maintaining, for some grammarians,[19] the original meaning of the term *jazāʾ*.

The fact that the terminology used by Sībawayhi reflects his conviction that a similarity exists between interrogative and conditional sentences, is described in the following passage of *al-Kitāb*:[20]

[الاستفهام] كالأمر في أنه غير واجب،[21] وأنه يريد [به][22] من المخاطَب أمرا لم يستقر عند السائل. ألا ترى أن جوابه جزم[23] [. . .] لأنها حروف ضارعت بما بعدها ما بعد

---

[16] Dévényi, "The treatment," 14.
[17] Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ ʿalā al-alfiyya*, 377; 380.
[18] Zamaḫšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī al-naḥw*, 151.
[19] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 508, Derenbourg 2, 339/Hārūn 4, 235; Zamaḫšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī al-naḥw*, 151.
[20] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 28, Derenbourg 1, 40/Hārūn 1, 99.
[21] Ibid., note (1) Hārūn: يعني غير واقع، يجوز أن يقع وألا يقع "That is to say it is only possible, it may occur or not".
[22] Ibid., Hārūn: [به].
[23] Ibid., note (2) al-Sīrāfī (b. 279–289/892–902; d. 2 Rajab 368/2 February 979–984): يعني ألا ترى أن جواب الاستفهام جزم كما يكون جواب الأمر. تقول أين زيد آته، كما تقول ائتني آتك "That is to say, don't you see that the interrogative expression can be followed by an apodosis and that, when it is followed by an apodosis, the verbal form which appears in such apodosis is apocopated, as well as the imperative expression can be followed by an apodosis and, when it is followed by an apodosis, the verbal form which appears in such

حروف الجزاء، وجوابها كجوابه[24] وقد يصير معنى حديثها إليه.[25] وهي غير واجبة كالجزاء [. . .]. ألا ترى أنك إذا قلت: أين عبد الله آته، فكأنك قلت: حيثما يكن آته.

The interrogative expression is like the imperative expression inasmuch its character is non-necessary.[26] By means of an interrogative expression in fact, the one to whom the question is addressed is asked about what is doubtful for the one who asks. Don't you see that the interrogative expression can be followed by an apodosis and that, when it is followed by an apodosis, the verbal form which appears in such apodosis is apocopated? In fact, interrogative propositions can carry out the same function as the function of the protasis of a conditional-hypothetical sentence, and the apocopate that follows them is like the apocopate that follows the protasis of the conditional-hypothetical sentence, so that these interrogative expressions

apodosis is apocopated? You say 'Where is Zayd that I may go and see him?' as well as you say 'Come and see me, and I'll come and see you!' ".

24 Ibid., note (3) Hārūn: أي جواب الجزاء. وفي الأصل: كجوابها (...) "That is to say the apodosis of the conditional-hypothetical sentence. Originally: 'like the apocopate that follows the proposition introduced by the conditional particles' (...)".

25 Ibid., note (4) Hārūn: أي إذا قلت أين زيد آته، فأين زيد استفهام بمنزلة الشرط لأن بعده جزاء كما بعد الشرط جزاء "That is to say, when you say 'Where is Zayd that I may go and see him?', 'Where is Zayd?' is an interrogative expression which carries out the function of protasis of a conditional-hypothetical sentence, in fact it is followed by an apodosis as well as the protasis of a conditional-hypothetical sentence is followed by an apodosis".

26 That is to say 'possible and non-necessary' i.e. 'contingent'. What leads us to translate *ġayru wāǧibin* by means of 'non-necessary' is the fact that Sībawayhi defines *in* as *mubhama* "uncertain" and therefore when he speaks of *jazāʾ* he only refers to conditional-*hypothetical* expressions, in which the condition is *possible and non-necessary*. Probably by Sībawayhi, along with the first Aristotle, 'uncertainty' was simply a characteristic of 'possibility'. Initially in fact, Aristotle excluded 'necessarily true' propositions from the category of 'possible' propositions. He erroneously—see J. Łukasiewicz, *Modal Logic* (Warzawa: Polish Scientific Publishers, 1970), 26—stated in *De Interpretatione* that 'possibility' implies 'non-necessity': Cf. Aristoteles (B.C. 350) *Categoriae et Liber de interpretatione*, ed. L. Minio-Paluello (London: Oxford University Press, 1949). We think that the term 'non-necessary' (in logic 'contingent') describes better the modal character of conditional-hypothetical expressions. Infact, regarding القول فيه [الجزاء] كالقول في الاستفهام "The conditional expression is like the interrogative expression" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 385/Hārūn 3, 59), Sīrāfī comments: الاستفهام يؤول معناه إلى الجزاء وليس بحديث بالحقيقة لأن الحديث ما كان خبرا (Jahn, *Sībawaihi's Buch* 1.2, 102, note 10) which we translate "The meaning of the interrogative expression is similar to that of the conditional expression as the interrogative expression, belonging to the hypothetical/virtual domain, has a non-assertive/non-factual character". In fact, Sīrāfī's comment seems to us more generally referred to the fact that both interrogative and conditional expressions would have a non-assertive character, character which is pointed out by Jahn's explanation of غير واجبة كالجزاء وهي [حروف الاستفهام] (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 28, Derenbourg 1, 40/Hārūn 1, 99) by "*insofern beide keine wirklich geschehene Thatsache ausdrücken*" (Jahn, *Sībawaihi's Buch* 1.1, 63).

can acquire a conditional-hypothetical semantic value. They have in fact the same non-necessary character as the conditional-hypothetical sentence [...].[27] Don't you see that when you say 'Where is 'Abdullah that I may go and see him?', it is as if you said 'Wherever he were, I would go and see him'.

The whole passage actually consists in the explanation that it is possible that interrogative and imperative utterances carry out the function of protasis of a conditional-hypothetical sentence. What is explained is that the uncertainty of the premise, on which depends the uncertainty of the consequence in a conditional-hypothetical sentence, is either secured by conditional-hypothetical particles (*in* and similar) which introduce the first utterance, operating at the same time the apocope of the verbal form contained in it, or it is intrinsic to the first utterance being an imperative proposition (*ġayr wāqiʿa*,[28] and after all already apocopated) or an interrogative proposition (introduced by particles which render it *ġayr wājiba*).[29] This is in our opinion the sense of Sībawayhi's statement about the fact that فإن أبدا مبهمة وكذلك حروف الجزاء "In fact *in* is always uncertain, as conditional particles are"[30] and that حروف الجزاء تَجزم الأفعال ويَنجزم الجوابُ بما قبله "Conditional particles operate the apocope of the verbs, being the apodosis apocopated by what precedes [i.e. protasis]",[31] and this is the sense of the equation *mā baʿda ḥurūfi al-jazāʾi*[32] = *al-šarṭu* "the condition"[33] = protasis of the conditional-hypothetical sentence.

3. From Semantics to Syntax

The meaning of *mubhama*, *ġayr wājiba*, and *ġayr wāqiʿa*, both in terms of 'intentions of the speaker' and in terms of 'functional meaning of linguistic categories' is that of 'non-assertion', which restricts the expression to the

---

[27] Once again القول فيه [الجزاء] كالقول في الاستفهام "The conditional expression is like the interrogative expression" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 385/Hārūn 3, 59). It is meaningful to report one more time the clarifying comment of Sīrāfī الاستفهام يؤول معناه إلى الجزاء وليس بحديث بالحقيقة لأن الحديث ماكان خبرا (Jahn, *Sībawayhi's Buch* 1.2, 102, note 10) about the fact that both expressions do not carry any truth value (they are neither true, neither false) inasmuch as they are not assertive.

[28] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 28, Derenbourg 1, 40/Hārūn 1, 99, note (1) Hārūn: يعني غير واقع، يجوز أن يقع وألا يقع "That is to say it is only possible, it may occur or not".

[29] Ibid.

[30] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 385/Hārūn 3, 60.

[31] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 386/Hārūn 3, 62.

[32] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 28, Derenbourg 1, 40/Hārūn 1, 99.

[33] Ibid., note (4): Hārūn.

domain of 'virtuality', that is to say to the domain of 'what exists though not in actual fact'.[34] Such character of the expression is normally rendered by means of the apocope of the verb, which in the Arabic language is a trait common to conditional-hypothetical sentences and to imperative, jussive, injunctive and prohibitive sentences.

The formal mechanism described by Sībawayhi presents the conditional-hypothetical sentence as a structure of two clauses having 'possible and non-necessary' (i.e. 'uncertain') character, the first of which is either apocopated or imperative or interrogative (protasis) and the second of which (apodosis)—apocopated—is operated by the protasis. The formal mechanism described by Zamaḫšarī presents instead the conditional sentence—hypothetical and non-hypothetical (which differs from the hypothetical inasmuch as it has a 'certain' character: i.e. 'possible and necessary'[35] or 'impossible')—as a structure of two clauses both of which are directly operated by the conditional particle (respectively *in* or *law*).[36]

---

[34] It is worth citing here a passage from the first chapter of *al-Kitāb* (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 1, Derenbourg 1, 1/Hārūn 1, 12), quoted by Versteegh: وأما الفعل فأمثلة أخذت من لفظ أحداث الأسماء وبنيت لما مضى ولما يكون ولم يقع وما هو كائن لم ينقطع [...] and translated by him "Verbs are patterns taken from the expression of the events of the nouns; they are construed for what is past; *for what is going to be, but has not yet happened*; and for what is being without interruption" (K. Versteegh, *The Arabic Language* [Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997], 77). Versteegh's translation, strongly temporalising and based on the model of 'temporal tripartition' (ibid., 84), does not in our opinion completely fit the concept of *ġayru wāqiʿin* as cleared by Hārūn's note.

[35] The reason for the higher inclusiveness of *in*-systems introduced by grammarians posterior to Sībawayhi and to Ibn Jinnī is in our opinion due to the fact that they recognised that 'possibility' is actually included in 'necessity'. For them, necessary propositions would therefore be 'possible and necessary'. In the same way, Aristotle initially excluded 'necessarily true propositions' from the category of 'possible propositions'. He later corrected his assumption, first in *De Interpretatione* and then in *Analytica priora*, and stated that 'necessity' implies 'possibility'. Cf. Aristoteles, *De interpretatione*; *idem, Prior Analytics*, tr. A.J. Jenkinson, Oxford University Press, 1928, and *Prior and posterior analytics*, ed. W.D. Ross (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1949). On *in*-systems by Arab grammarians posterior to Sībawayhi and Ibn Jinnī, including suffixed verbal forms along with 'protocolarly' apocopated verbal forms, see Giolfo, "I sistemi condizionali in *in* dell'arabo classico" and *idem*, "*in yaqum vs in qāma*".

[36] Zamaḫšarī (d. 1144) limits the set of conditional particles to only two elements, *in* and *law*, being the latter, for the said reasons, not included in Sībawayhi classification: إن ولو تدخلان على جملتين فتجعلان الأولى شرطا والثانية جزاء "*In and law* operate on two sentences, rendering the first 'condition' and the second 'consequence'" (Zamaḫšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī al-naḥw*, quoted in Dévényi, "The treatment," 19). Zamaḫšarī's classification was generally accepted at that time and, despite the criticisms of later grammarians as for his inclusion of *law* among conditional particles, is still the classification followed nowadays in contemporary grammar.

Imperative and interrogative expressions can carry out the function of the protasis of a conditional-hypothetical sentence inasmuch as they are provided of the same 'uncertain' character of which is provided the protasis of a conditional-hypothetical sentence. They can occupy the place of a *šarṭ*, they can have the same semantic-syntactic function as a *jazm* and can thus be followed by a *jazm* in the same way in which the *šarṭ* is followed by a *jazm*. What Sībawayhi states is that the conditional particle (*in*), operates the apocope of the verb of a proposition transforming it by means of this operation under two respects: the particle transfers to the proposition the same uncertainty of which the particle is provided and at the same time the particle renders the proposition a proposition which cannot stand alone (protasis) but must necessarily be followed by another proposition (apodosis), on which the same twofold transformation (i.e. that the second proposition results uncertain and the fact that it is not independent from the first proposition) is operated by means of the apocope of the verb in the second proposition. This last operation is operated by the protasis. Both clauses result in being 'uncertain' and 'non-independent'.

Zamaḫšarī sheds light on the fact that the function of all conditional particles, and not only of hypothetical ones, is that of rendering two propositions inseparable in a structure which represents the relationship of implication. If the semantic characteristic common to interrogative, imperative and conditional-hypothetical expressions can be summarised by the term 'uncertainty', the syntactic characteristic common to interrogative and conditional expressions is represented by the fact that both the conditional particle, introducing the protasis of the conditional sentence, and the interrogative particle, which introduces the interrogative sentence, are not particles of conjunction:[37] ألا ترى أنك إذا استفهمت لم تجعل ما بعده صلة [38] "Don't you see that, when you use an interrogative particle, what follows such a particle is not *ṣila*?"[39]

[37] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 385/Hārūn 3, 59.

[38] The Arabic *ṣila* designates a sentence after a *mawṣūl* either *ismī* (relative pronouns) either *ḥarfī* (particles of conjunction). The expression 'is not *ṣila*' could be explained as 'is not in relation with what precedes', where the concept of 'being in relation with what precedes' is wider than the concept of 'relative clause'. The expressions 'is not *ṣila* of what precedes' and 'is not *waṣl* of what precedes' could be then understood as: 'is not dependent on what precedes'. What, in our opinion, we should read here is that both in the conditional and in the interrogative expression, the conditional particle introducing the conditional expression and the interrogative particle introducing the interrogative expression are not subordinative conjunctions.

[39] This translation finds its justification in Sībawayhi's statement: إذا قلت أين تكون وأنت تستفهم فليس الفعل بصلة لما قبله. "When you ask 'Where are you?', the verb is not *ṣila* of what precedes it" (Ibid.).

فالوجه أن تقول: الفعل ليس في الجزاء[40] بصلة لما قبله كما أنه في حروف الاستفهام[41] ليس صلة لما قبله، كما أنك إذا قلت أين تكون وأنت تستفهم فليس[42] الفعل بصلة لما قبله، فهذا في الجزاء ليس بصلة لما قبله، كما أن ذلك في الاستفهام ليس بوصل لما قبله.[43]

The best thing you can say[44] is: 'The verb in the conditional expression is not *ṣila* of what precedes it,[45] as well as with the interrogative particles the verb is not *ṣila* of what precedes it',[46] and when you say 'Wherever you were, I would be', it is not[47] *ṣila* of what precedes it, as well as, when you question saying 'Where are you?', the verb[48] is not *ṣila* of what precedes it, in the conditional expression it is not *ṣila* of what precedes it,[49] as well as it is not *waṣl* of what precedes it in the interrogative expression.[50]

وتقول: من يضربُك في الاستفهام، و في الجزاء: من يضربْك أضربْه، فالفعل فيهما غير صلة.[51]

You say: 'Who beats you?' when asking, and in the conditional expression: 'Whoever beat you, I would beat him', and in both the verb is not *ṣila*.[52]

---

[40] In the proposition introduced by conditional particles, i.e. in the protasis of the conditional sentence.

[41] In the proposition introduced by interrogative particles.

[42] *fa-laysa* "is not" is referred to the verb in the protasis of the conditional sentence حيثما تكن أكن "Wherever you were, I would be". In fact, whilst the expression أين تكون "Where are you?", in the following line, is an interrogative sentence, *ḥayṯu-mā takun* "wherever you were", being only a part of the conditional sentence حيثما تكن أكن "Wherever you were, I would be", is not quoted independently of the whole conditional sentence.

[43] Sībawayhi (Ibid.). "*Man sollte sich also korrekt so ausdrücken: Das Verbum ist in Bedingungssätzen ebensowenig Ṣila des Vorhergehenden* (*d.i. der Konditionalpartikel*) *wie in Fragesätzen* (*Ṣila der Fragepartikel*)," Jahn, *Sībawayhi's Buch* 2.1, 168.

[44] Often *al-wajh* is synonymous with *ḥadd al-kalām* "the normal way of expression", cf. A. Levin, "Sībawayhi's view of the syntactic structure of *kāna wa-aḫawātu-hā*," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 1 (1979): 185–213 [repr. in A. Levin, *Arabic linguistic thought and dialectology*, (Jerusalem, 1998), 211].

[45] The conditional particle.

[46] The interrogative particle.

[47] The verb 'to be' refers here to the verb in the protasis of the conditional sentence حيثما تكن أكن "Wherever you were, I would be".

[48] That is to say the verb in the interrogative sentence أين تكون "Where are you?".

[49] The verb in the protasis of the conditional sentence is not *ṣila* of the conditional particle: the conditional particle is not a particle of conjunction.

[50] The verb in the interrogative sentence is not *ṣila* of the interrogative particle: the interrogative particle is not a particle of conjunction. "*Man sollte sich also correct so ausdrücken: Das Verbum ist in Bedingungssätzen ebensowenig Ṣila des Vorhergehenden* (*d.i. der Conditionalpartikel*) *wie in Fragesätzen* (*Ṣila der Fragepartikel*)"; Jahn, *Sībawaihi's Buch* 2.1, 168.

[51] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 385/Hārūn 3, 59.

[52] Is not *ṣila* of what precedes. That is: the verb in the protasis of the conditional sentence is not *ṣila* of the conditional particle and the verb in the interrogative sentence is

If what accounted for clarifies in which sense the terminology by which Sībawayhi refers to the apodosis is based on the fact that for Sībawayhi interrogative and conditional-hypothetical expressions have in common[53] a semantic and a syntactic aspect, it also enables to consider that the three sub-domains of linguistic expression—i.e. interrogative, imperative, and conditional-hypothetical—would belong to the common domain of 'virtuality' ('virtual domain') as opposed at the same time to the domain of facts ('factual' domain) and to the domain of subordination ('conceptual domain'). For Sībawayhi, *in* is not a conjunction; the apodosis is *maʿmūl* "operated" by the complex *in*+protasis. For Zamaḫšarī, who does not subvert Sībawayhi's assumptions about the semantic characteristic of conditional-hypothetical sentences, the second *maʿmūl* is *maʿmūl* of the *maʿmūl* of the *ʿāmil* "operator", thus being itself *maʿmūl* of the *ʿāmil*. In other terms, defining the *ʿāmil* as a binary operator, it is possible to switch to a simpler representation, where both the protasis and the apodosis are *maʿmūl* of *in* and are not *ṣila* of *in*.[54] Zamaḫšarī's words clearly indicate that both *in* and *law* are not logically translated by 'if', but instead by 'if… then', which is to say that they are binary operators. This explains why Sībawayhi, focusing on hypothetical sentences, clearly stated that conditional particles operate the apocope of the verbs:[55] such a syntactical description/prescription coincides with his way of representing the implication relatively to conditional-hypothetical sentences. That a verb should be apocopated must actually signify that the proposition which contains it has 'uncertain' character (otherwise the verbal form would belong to the suffixed conjugation), that it has not an assertive character (otherwise the verbal form would belong to the prefixed conjugation in its *marfūʿ* variant), that it is not dependent (otherwise the verbal form

---

not *ṣila* of the interrogative particle. Therefore: the conditional particle is not a particle of conjunction and the interrogative particle is not a particle of conjunction.

[53] [الاستفهام] كالأمر في أنه غير واجب، وأنه يريد [به] من المخاطَب أمرا لم يستقرَّ عند السائل "The interrogative expression is like the imperative expression inasmuch its character is non-necessary. By means of an interrogative expression in fact, the one to whom the question is addressed is asked about what is doubtful for the one who asks" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 28, Derenbourg 1, 40/Hārūn 1, 99).

[54] إن ولو تدخلان على جملتين فتجعلان الأولى شرطا والثانية جزاء "*in* and *law* operate on two sentences, rendering the first 'condition' and the second 'consequence' (Zamaḫšarī, *Kitāb al-mufaṣṣal fī al-naḥw*, ed. J.P. Broch, Christianiae, 1859, quoted in Dévényi: "The treatment of conditional sentences," *The Arabist* 1 (1988):19).

[55] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 386/Hārūn 3, 62: حروف الجزاء تَجزم الأفعال ويَنجزم الجوابُ بما قبله "Conditional particles operate the apocope of the verbs, being the apodosis apocopated by what precedes [i.e. protasis]".

would belong to the prefixed conjugation in its *manṣūb* variant), that is to say that either it is independent, or it is not independent and at the same time it is not *ṣila*.

4. The Prototypical Verbal Form in the Conditional Context

Arab grammarians refer to the conditional particles through a non-uniform terminology, and the list of conditional particles is not the same for all early grammarians. According to Sībawayhi,[56] the conditional particles are *ayya ḥīnin*, *matā*, *ayna*, *anā*, *haythu-mā, in*, *iḏā-mā,* and the conditional nouns[57] *man*, *mā*, *ayyu-hum*. He indicates the particle *in* as the 'mother' (*umm*), that is the 'root' (*aṣl*) of all conditional particles, being *in* the one and only particle which does not have any other functions, and therefore possessing a purely conditional meaning.[58] According to Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1002), the set of the conditional particles and their classification is essentially the same as for Sībawayhi. Both of them use the same classification for the conditional particles, which assumes by Ibn Jinnī the denomination of *aḫawāt in*[59] "sisters of *in*", due to the outstanding conditional character of the latter, which makes of it an *aṣl* "root". However, two other authors, Ibn al-Ḥājib (m. 646/1249)[60] and Ibn Mālik (d. 672/1274),[61] classify the conditional particles among other particles under the terminology *al-jāzimāt li-al-muḍāriʿ* so that they are no more presented as conditional 'operators' (*ʿawāmil*), but they are equalised with any formal operator causing the apocope of the verb as, for example, the particle *lam* for the negative past and the particle *lā* for the negative form of the imperative.[62] In so doing, one could say that they recognised not only 'one' syntactic behaviour, but also implicitly defined the apocope of the verb as representing 'one' specific pragmatic-semantic function. It is

[56] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 384/Hārūn 3, 56.

[57] Arab grammarians distinguish between 'conditional particles' (*ḥurūf*) and 'conditional nouns' (*asmāʾ*). *Man*, *mā* and *ayyuhum* are nouns. It is possible to group conditional particles and nouns as 'conditional operators'. As Dévényi points out, "originally *ḥarf* did not only mean a part of speech ('particle') but a function, too. This means that even an *ism* was allowed to occur in the function of *ḥarf*" (Dévényi, "The treatment", 39, note 11).

[58] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 386/Hārūn 3, 63; Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 256, Derenbourg 1, 406/Hārūn 3, 112.

[59] Ibn Jinnī, *Kitāb al-lumaʿ fī al-naḥw*, ed. H.M. Kechrida, (Uppsala, 1976), 54.

[60] Ibn al-Ḥājib, *al-Kāfiya*, in Molla Jāmī, *al-Fawāʾid al-ḍiyāʾiyya, Molla Jāmī ʿalā al-Kāfiya*, (Istanbul, n.d.), 227–229.

[61] Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ ʿalā al-alfiyya*, 22.

[62] Ibn al-Ḥājib, *al-Kāfiya*, 227–229.

interesting to see how Ibn Mālik[63] introduced, within the same set of 'particles operating the apocope of the verb' (*jawāzim*) a distinction between those operating on a single verb and those operating on two verbal forms, being the latter in fact conditional particles. The particle *law* appears among the conditional particles in Ibn al-Ḥājib's classification too, but it is not mentioned in the chapter concerning *al-šarṭ wa-al-jazāʾ*.

The apocopated form of the *muḍāriʿ* (*al-fiʿl al-majzūm*) appears thus by early Arab grammarians as a prototypical form in the conditional context, representing the protocolar 'uncertain' character of hypothetical expressions. If we look in fact at the conditional systems of the type *in šarṭ jawāb al-šarṭ* by early Arab grammarians, namely:[64]

Sībawayhi (d. 793)[65]
in yaqum yaqum
[*in qāma yaqum*][66]

[63] Ibn Mālik, *Alfiyya*, in: Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ ʿalā al-alfiyya* (Cairo: 1965), 22.

[64] In the following tables, *in yaqum/qāma yaqum/qāma* expressions are treated as morpho-syntactic structures.

[65] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*.

[66] The brackets mean here that Sībawayhi considers this combination of verbal forms "as secondary compared to the basic *jazm* + *jazm* combination" (Dévényi, "The treatment," 25). Consistently with his cardinal rules حروف الجزاء تَجزم الأفعال ويَنجزم الجوابُ بما قبله "Conditional particles operate the apocope of the verbs, being the apodosis apocopated by what precedes [i.e. protasis]" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 386/Hārūn 3, 62) and أصل الجزاء الفعل "The verb is the origin of the conditional sentence" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 252, Derenbourg 1, 398/Hārūn 3, 91), Sībawayhi explains that the *qāma* form "in the protasis does not only occupy the place of the original *jazm* but it takes over its role, too" (Dévényi, "The treatment," 26) as it governs the verb in *jazm* in the apodosis. This *qāma* form is for Sībawayhi في موضع الفعل المجزوم "occupies the place and takes the role of the original apocopated verb" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 388/Hārūn 3, 68). In non-formal terms, if the essence of the conditional sentences lays in their characteristic of uncertainty (uncertainty about the feasibility of the condition, and, as a consequence, uncertainty about the feasibility of the event subject to that condition), this combination of verbal forms would represent a particular hypothetical (uncertain) expression in that the uncertainty of the consequence is safe despite the certainty of the condition. As for the combination *qāma qāma*, Sībawayhi only mentions it as an example of his preference for symmetric construction (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 252, Derenbourg 1, 398/Hārūn 3, 91–92: وإذا قال إن فعلتَ فأحسنُ الكلام أن تقول: فعلتُ، لأنه مثلُه "And when someone says '*in faʿalta*', the best thing to say is: '*faʿaltu*', as it is like it") but he does not mention it in the chapter on 'conditional sentences' (*bābu al-jazāʾi*). This combination cannot be included in Sībawayhi's conditional-hypothetical system as a result of three of his statements: حروف الجزاء تَجزم الأفعال ويَنجزم الجوابُ بما قبله "Conditional particles operate the apocope of the verbs, being the apodosis apocopated by what precedes [i.e. protasis]" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 386/Hārūn 3, 62), أصل الجزاء الفعل "The verb

Ibn Jinnī (d. 1002)[67]
in yaqum yaqum

Zamaḫšarī (d. 1144)[68]
in yaqum yaqum
in yaqum qāma
in qāma qāma
in qāma yaqum

Ibn al-Ḥājib (d. 1249)[69]
in yaqum yaqum
in qāma qāma
in qāma yaqum

Ibn Mālik (d. 1274)[70]
in yaqum yaqum
[*in yaqum qāma*][71]
in qāma qāma
in qāma yaqum

we notice that the only combination allowed by all these five grammarians is *in yaqum yaqum*. Moreover, our analysis of all the occurrences of structures of the type *in šarṭ jawāb al-šarṭ* in the Koran showed that the 87% is of the type *in yaqum yaqum*, whilst the type *in qāma qāma* only covers the remaining 13%.[72]

---

is the origin of the conditional sentence" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 252, Derenbourg 1, 398/ Hārūn 3, 91) and فإن أبدا مبهمة وكذلك حروف الجزاء "*in* is always uncertain, as conditional particles are" (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 245, Derenbourg 1, 385/Hārūn 3, 60).

[67] *Kitāb al-lumaʿ fī al-naḥw*, 54: الشرط والجواب مجزومان "Both the protasis and the apodosis are apocopated".

[68] *al-Mufaṣṣal fī al-naḥw*, 150: ولا يخلو الفعلان في باب إن من أن يكونا مضارعين أو ماضيين أو أحدهما مضارعا والآخر ماضيا. فإذا كانا مضارعين فليس فيهما إلا الجزم "Within a conditional sentence introduced by *in*, the verbs can only be two prefixed forms or two suffixed forms, or one of the two verbs can be a prefixed form and the other one a suffixed form. When the case is that the verbs are two prefixed forms, then they are both apocopated".

[69] *al-Kāfiya*, 227–229.

[70] *Alfiyya*, vol. 1, 22; vol. 2, 370–371, 372–374, 377, 380, 385.

[71] This structure is considered rare by Ibn ʿAqīl. In order to justify its presence in Ibn Mālik's system, he quotes the *ḥadīṯ* من يقم ليلة القدر غُفر له ما تقدم من ذنبه "Those who keep vigil in prayer on the Night of Revelation, their previous sins will be forgiven", cf. Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ ʿalā al-alfiyya*, vol. 1, 22; vol. 2, 372.

[72] For more detailed data, see Giolfo, "I sistemi condizionali in *in* dell'arabo classico".

5. European Grammars

As for European grammarians,[73] the priority order used by them to list the set of verbal forms allowed in conditional sentences is the same for all (with the exception of Fischer): either the perfect, or the apocopate. According to Fischer the order is: apocopate or perfect.

As for the value of the perfect and of the apocopate in conditional sentences, according to Wright the perfect represents an action whose occurrence is so certain that it can be considered as already occurred; according to Veccia Vaglieri the perfect in the Arabic hypothetical structures fulfils its function by presenting as completed the facts mentioned in the protasis and in the apodosis; according to Blachère and Gaudefroy-Demombynes it indicates that the speaker considers the idea that he formulates as already realised; according to Fischer it represents the perfective aspect, and according to Corriente in the conditional structures the perfect shows its full aspectual value, that is its perfective aspect indicating a process which becomes real as a whole.

For Wright the jussive following *in*, or other words having the same sense, has always the meaning of a perfect: he explains that the jussive is used in a protasis depending from *in* or similar particles, because, when something is presumed or assumed, it is as if an order is issued that this event occurs or happens, and again according to Wright this becomes manifest in the fact that the jussive is used in apodosis depending both on imperative protasis and on conditional ones. As far as the value of the apocopate in conditional sentences is concerned, we remark that only one fact exists which leads to the conclusion that Veccia Vaglieri wished to underline the privileged bond between the apocopate and the conditional structures of the Arabic language: the fact that she inserted the notions on the hypothetical sentence in the chapter concerning the 'conditional-jussive' mood. According to Blachère and Gaudefroy-Demombynes the apocopate represents a process whose realisation is uncertain or conditional, and they find in this statement the reason for the use of the apocopate in sentences containing a notion of eventuality or having a hypothetical content, in injunctive or prohibitive sentences, and after *lam* "not …" and *lammā* "not yet" with a meaning, in the latter case, of past. If they state

---

[73] The five treatises by leading European grammarians which we have examined are mentioned in note 3. For a more detailed treatment see Giolfo, "Le strutture condizionali dell'arabo classico nella tradizione grammaticale araba e nella tradizione grammaticale europea".

that the perfect represents the fact that the speaker considers the eventuality or the hypothesis that he expresses as already realised, the use of the imperfect would be instead tied to the presence of particles which underline 'uncertainty'. Fischer states that the apocopate has the function of a perfect, both when it is associated with the particle *lam* or *lammā*, and when it appears in conditional sentences. Corriente presents the apocopate as the simplest morphologic form of the imperfect, and points out that its uniformity is poor in terms of its semantic-syntactic content, being the apocopate required by some negative particles which give to it (like *lam*) the sense of the perfect (which according to Corriente is synchronically unjustified) or by others which give to it (like *lā*) a prohibitive meaning, or by conjunctions like *li-* for the jussive or the exhortative, as well as it can be required for conditional structures.

Both Wright and Fischer speak of 'protasis' and 'apodosis' according to the classical terminology which refers to the apodosis as to the main clause, and to the protasis as to the subordinate clause. Veccia Vaglieri conceives the 'condition' as a subordinate sentence, and the 'answer' as a main sentence. Only Blachère and Gaudefroy-Demombynes treat the conditional structures in a special chapter, dedicated to the 'double sentence', in which the two clauses which form the sentence are not seen in a relationship of subordination, nor in a mere relationship of juxtaposition, as it is their particular relationship which renders the exact scope of the expression. Corriente underlines that the situation is not simply that one clause is subordinate to a main one, but that a clause (condition or protasis), which should be, in principle, the subordinate, can affect the other one (apodosis or conditioned clause), which in turns should be the main clause, though generally following the protasis in this interrelation.

According to Wright *in* is the conditional particle introducing possible hypothesis, and *law* the particle introducing impossible hypothesis. According to Veccia Vaglieri, the two main *conjunctions* translating 'if' are *in* and *law*. The difference between them is that *in* is used for a real or possible hypothesis, while *law* is used for the unreal one, i.e. opposite to reality. Also Blachère and Gaudefroy-Demombynes distinguish between the 'double sentence' '*hypothétique réalisable*', introduced by *in*, and the 'double sentence' '*hypothétique irréalisable*', introduced by *law*. Fischer distinguishes between two kinds of conditional sentence: the real conditional sentence and the unreal conditional sentence. *In* "*wenn*" introduces the real conditional sentences, *law* introduces the potential and unreal conditional sentences. Corriente states that the real affirmative

conditional sentence is introduced by *in* "if", while the unreal conditional sentence is introduced by *law*.

6. *YAQUM VS QĀMA* WITHIN *IN SHARṬ JAWĀB AL-SHARṬ* CONDITIONAL CONTEXT

As far as the structure of the type *in šarṭ jawāb al-šarṭ* is taken into consideration, if *yaqum yaqum* is indeed the only combination shared by early Arab grammarians, nevertheless their systems do also include *qāma* forms. Ibn ʿAqīl[74] (d. 1367) lists all possible combinations of verbal forms, which generate four different structures. The English translation below each different structure is meant to show that it is still problematic to disclose the semantic differences between the different verbal combinations, whose existence seem to be implicit in Sībawayhi's principle that any syntactic variation has its semantic counterpart.[75]

in yaqum Zaydun yaqum ʿAmrun
if to get up (prefix conjugation variant-Ø 3^{rd} p m s) Zayd (n) to get up (prefix conjugation variant-Ø 3^{rd} p m s) ʿAmr (n)
"If Zayd gets up, ʿAmr will get up"

in qāma Zaydun qāma ʿAmrun
if to get up (suffix conjugation 3^{rd} p m s) Zayd (n) to get up (suffix conjugation 3^{rd} p m s) ʿAmr (n)
"If Zayd gets up, ʿAmr will get up"

in yaqum Zaydun qāma ʿAmrun
if to get up (prefix conjugation variant-Ø 3^{rd} p m s) Zayd (n) to get up (suffix conjugation 3^{rd} p m s) ʿAmr (n)
"If Zayd gets up, ʿAmr will get up"

in qāma Zaydun yaqum ʿAmrun
if to get up (suffix conjugation 3^{rd} p m s) Zayd (n) to get up (prefix conjugation variant-Ø 3^{rd} p m s) ʿAmr (n)
"If Zayd gets up, ʿAmr will get up"

In order to find the key to disclose the different semantic interpretations which must be underlying the different morpho-syntactic structures of the system, we looked at how the early Arab tradition represented the system over the centuries. It is evident that the tables representing the

---

74 Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ ʿalā al-alfiyya*.
75 In the following list, *in yaqum/qāma Zaydun yaqum/qāma ʿAmrun* expressions are treated as morpho-syntactic structures.

verbal forms combinations considered by Arab grammarians, in virtue of the prototypical position of the structure *in yaqum yaqum*, appear as variations, in some cases more inclusive—and in some others less inclusive—of the combination(s) allowed by Sībawayhi. One important fact is that the existence of variation in terms of higher/lower inclusiveness of the system actually proves the existence of a semantic differentiation among structures generated by different verbal forms combinations. What is also evident is a sequence from earlier systems to later systems which ranges from lower inclusiveness to higher inclusiveness in terms of admitted verbal form combinations. In our opinion, the answer to the question 'what are the semantic differences within the four structures listed by Ibn ʿAqīl?' consists in the answer to the question 'How is the lower and higher inclusiveness of verbal forms combinations justified within the history of this particular system in early Arab grammatical tradition?'. An answer may be provided by a modal interpretation of the opposition between *yaqum* and *qāma* verbal forms within the conditional context.

Our position takes distance from the Semitistic paradigm which states that the Arabic jussive is nothing but the old proto-Semitic perfect **yíqtVl*,[76] which would clearly cancel all possibilities of semantic differentiation among verbal forms combinations within the conditional system introduced by *in*.[77]

Our hypothesis is in fact that within the conditional context *yaqum* forms do not represent either two different tenses or two aspects, but rather two different modal categories, namely the two Aristotelian modal categories of 'possibility' (*yaqum*) and 'necessity' (*qāma*). Modal logic was developed by Aristotle in *De Interpretatione* and in *Analytica Priora*.[78]

---

76 An important datum in these respects is that, in Koranic Arabic, with *in*, *lam yafʿal* is not the only negation. There is in fact also another negation: *lā yafʿal* (P. Larcher, "Les systèmes conditionnels en *in* de l'arabe classique," *Bulletin d'Études Orientales*, tome LVIII, 2008–2009, (2009): 205–232; p. 207ff), and with no exceptions *lā yafʿal* is the negative counterpart of *yafʿal* whilst *lam yafʿal* is the negative counterpart of *faʿala* (P. Larcher, "Les 'complexes de phrases' de l'arabe classique," *Kervan* 6 (2007): 29–45, www.kervan.unito.it: p. 35). See H. Reckendorf, *Arabische Syntax*, Heidelberg, C. Winter 1921 [2., unveränderte Auflage. Heidelberg, C. Winter 1977], 487: "*lam mit Apok. ist die Verneinigung des Perf.* (...). *Seltener ist lā mit Apok., das als Verneinigung eines Apok. zu verstehen ist*".

77 "In Arabic, too, when the imperfect is used with the conditional particle *in* (...), it refers to the past" (Versteegh, *The Arabic Language*, 17).

78 Cf. Giolfo, "*in yaqum vs in qāma*: un'ipotesi modale". The theory of modal propositions, i.e. of propositions which contain the word 'necessarily' or the word 'possibly' or an equivalent of these words, was developed by Aristotle in *De Interpretatione*, chapters 12 and 13, and in *Analytica priora*, I. 3 and 13. The theory of modal syllogisms, i.e. of syllogisms in which at least one of the premises is a modal proposition, was developed by Aristotle in *Analytica priora*, I. 8–22.

Propositions can be in principle divided into 'possible' and 'impossible' (necessarily false). Possible propositions are divided into 'contingent' (neither necessarily true nor necessarily false) and 'necessary' (necessarily true) propositions. At an initial phase, Aristotle excluded necessary propositions from the category of possible propositions. He erroneously affirmed in *De Interpretatione* that 'possibility' implies 'non-necessity'.[79] The same position seems to be adopted by Sībawayhi and Ibn Jinnī. In a second phase, Aristotle himself included within the possible propositions the necessarily true propositions. Already in *De Interpretatione* he realised that necessity implies possibility and corrected his assumption in *Analytica Priora*.[80] According to our hypothesis, both Sībawayhi and Ibn Jinnī would exclude the *qāma* verbal forms because these would represent necessarily true conditional sentences, whilst propositions represented by *yaqum* forms are possible and non-necessary. Propositions in which appears a *qāma* form would lack the feature of uncertainty and would therefore be non-hypothetical. Zamahšarī, Ibn Ḥājib and Ibn Mālik would include *qāma* forms in the system of conditional structures introduced by *in* because propositions in which appears a *qāma* form would be possible although necessary and, although non-hypothetical, they could be part of a conditional sentence.

The frontier between *yaqum* and *qāma* verbal forms within the system of conditional structures introduced by *in* appears then as a frontier between 'uncertainty' ('*possible and non-necessary*' propositions = 'contingent' propositions) and 'certainty' ('*possible and necessary*' propositions = 'necessary' propositions). Only 'contingent' propositions would contain a *yaqum* form.

As an example of how 'necessary' propositions could be part of a conditional sentence introduced by *in*, we would like to quote one conditional sentence taken from that 13% of the occurrences of *in šarṭ jawāb al-šarṭ* structures in the Koran in which the structure is *in qāma qāma*, whilst in the remaining 87% of the occurrences of *in šarṭ jawāb al-šarṭ* structures in the Koran the structure is *in yaqum yaqum*: 3/144 وما محمد إلا رسول قد خلت من قبله الرسل أفاين مات أو قُتل انقلبتم على أعقبكم "And Muḥammad is no more than an apostle; the apostles have already passed away before him; if he dies or is killed, will you turn back upon your heels?".

---

[79] He erroneously—cf. Łukasiewicz, *Modal Logic*, 26—stated in *De Interpretatione* that 'possibility' implies 'non-necessity'. Cf. Aristoteles, *De interpretatione*.

[80] Already in *De Interpretatione* and then in *Analytica priora*, Aristotle corrects his judgment, stating that 'necessity' implies 'possibility'.

We understand this Koranic verse as follows: If Muḥammad 'dies' (*māta*) or 'is killed' (*qutila*)—and he will *necessarily/certainly* die or be killed as he is no more than an apostle like those who have already passed away before him—will you *necessarily/certainly* 'turn back' (*inqalabtum*) upon your heels? (Would this certainty be enough for you to turn back upon your heels?). This reading would explain the presence of *qāma* form both in the protasis and in the apodosis.

7. *YAQUM VS QĀMA* WITHIN THE WIDER CONDITIONAL CONTEXT

If the frontier between *yaqum* and *qāma* verbal forms within the system of conditional structures introduced by *in* is interpreted as the frontier between the 'uncertainty' of *yaqum* forms appearing in *contingent propositions* as opposed to the certainty of *qāma* forms appearing in *necessary propositions*, the frontier between *yaqum* and *qāma* verbal forms within the whole conditional context of the Arabic language appears then as a frontier between 'uncertainty' and 'certainty' which separates *contingent propositions* at the same time from *necessary propositions*, and from *impossible propositions*.

The definition of *law* by Sībawayhi is: وأما لو، فلما كان سيقع لوقوع غيره "*law* is for what could have happened if something else had happened".[81] This definition is not part of the treatment that the *Kitāb* reserves to the conditional expression,[82] and it was further articulated—by grammarians posterior to Sībawayhi—in terms of 'impossibility' (*imtināʿ*).[83] For some of them *law* would be a particle introducing an impossible 'condition': they do not specify anything about the 'consequence'.[84] For others *law*

---

[81] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 508, Derenbourg 2, 334/Hārūn 4, 224.

[82] It is worth noting here that at the beginning of his article "Two Conceptions," 77, Versteegh, states that "The point of departure of this article is a remark in Dévényi's analysis (1988) of conditionality in the Arabic grammatical tradition. She remarks on the fact that within this tradition the particle *law* is not regarded as a conditional particle. Now, in traditional Western grammars *law* is always mentioned on a par with the particle *in*, both of them having a conditional meaning. Westerns grammarians distinguish between the two particles by stating that *in* indicates real conditions, whereas *law* indicates irreal conditions. Both particles are categorized as conjunctions".

[83] Cf. Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī al-labīb ʿan kutub al-aʿārīb*, ed. M. al-Mubārak, M.ʿA. Ḥamd Allāh, S. al-Afġānī, Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1969) 2, 283ff.

[84] For example Ibn Hišām (Ibid.); Versteegh ("Two Conceptions," 83) remarks that "He himself, however, does not believe that *law* indicates the impossibility of both parts of the conditional sentence, and he refutes their theory with an argument derived from logic: if both condition and conclusion are false, the opposite of both must be 'true' (*ṯābit*), and in many instances this is not the case".

would introduce an impossible ‘condition’ and an impossible ‘consequence’, being *ḥarfu imtināʿin li-imtināʿi ġayri-hi* “a particle indicating the impossibility of something as caused by the impossibility of something else”.[85] Ibn Hišām (m. 1360), however, points out that there are examples of expressions introduced by *law* in which the condition is impossible, but the consequence is necessary as it exists ‘independently of the existence of the condition’ (*wujida al-šarṭu aw fuqida*).[86] He therefore rejects the definition of *law* as *ḥarfu imtināʿin li-imtināʿi ġayri-hi* and sticks to the definition of *law* given by Sībawayhi, provided that the expression *li-wuqūʿ* is understood as ‘simultaneity’ (*ʿinda ṯubūti al-awwali*)[87] and is not restricted to the cause-effect relation between the condition and the consequence. Sībawayhi’s definition is in fact compatible both with impossible conditions and impossible consequences, and with impossible conditions and necessary consequences.

What is relevant for our hypothesis is that in all cases the condition is ‘certain’ and the consequence is ‘certain’. *Law* introduces impossible conditions (always false and therefore *certain*), to which are associated impossible consequences (always false and therefore *certain*) or necessary consequences (always true and therefore *certain*). Once accepted that only *uncertainty* (i.e. the ‘non-necessary’ character of the proposition) is associated with the apocopate,[88] it becomes clear why the apocopate cannot appear neither in the protasis neither in the apodosis of sentences introduced by *law*. It appears at this point also evident that the apocopated verbal form cannot be associated with *iḏā*, being *iḏā* not *mubhama* “uncertain”.

Conclusion: *yaqum vs qāma* within the Verbal System of the Arabic Language

As for the verbal system of the Arabic language, along with Massignon, who affirms that the perfect and imperfect represent, outside our tenses,

---

85 Versteegh, “Two Conceptions,” 84.

86 Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī al-labīb* 2, 283ff, quoted in Versteegh “Two Conceptions,” 83.

87 Versteegh (Ibid.).

88 فإن أبدا مبهمة وكذلك حروف الجزاء “In fact *in* is always uncertain, as conditional particles are” (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 345, Derenbourg 1, 385/Hārūn 3, 60) and حروف الجزاء تَجزم الأفعال ويَنجزم الجوابُ بما قبله “Conditional particles operate the apocope of the verbs, being the apodosis apocopated by what precedes i.e. protasis” (ibid., Derenbourg 1, 386/Hārūn 3, 62).

the degree of realisation of the action,[89] it appears to us that the entire verbal system of the Arabic language, made up of the prefixed conjugation and by the triplet of the prefixed conjugation, can be interpreted—within the different linguistic pragmatic contexts—basing on Sībawayhi's opposition 'certainty *vs* uncertainty' (in Massignon's terms 'reality *vs* irreality').

Our hypothesis is that verbal expressions which represent present or future facts as uncompleted actions clearly have an uncertain character, however, we must recognise that their uncertainty is different from the uncertainty of verbal expressions which represent uncompleted actions whose reality is complementary[90] to the reality of other actions on which they depend and to which they are subordinate. These two kinds of uncertainty ('factual uncertainty' and 'conceptual uncertainty') would be represented respectively by the prefixed conjugation variant-*u* and by the prefixed conjugation variant-*a*.

Verbal expressions representing uncompleted actions belonging to the 'factual domain' have an assertive character, are independent and are not introduced by any particle. Verbal expressions representing uncompleted actions belonging to the 'conceptual domain'[91] have non-assertive character, are subordinate, and are introduced by a subordinative conjunction.[92] There are then verbal forms—like jussive, prohibitive, negative, and imperative verbal forms—which have a non-assertive character,

---

[89] In his article "Le temps dans la pensée islamique" (1952): 143–144, L. Massignon, analysing the notion of 'time' and 'aspect', writes that Arabic grammar "*en principe, d'ailleurs, ne connaît que des 'aspects verbaux': l'accompli (māḍī) et l'inaccompli (muḍāriʿ), qui marquent, hors de notre temps, le <u>degré de réalisation de l'action</u>*": quoted in V. Monteil, *L'arabe moderne*, (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1960), 250. Cf. also A. Roman, "Le temps dans la langue et la culture d'Arabie et d'Islam. Paroles, signes, mythes," *Mélanges offerts à Jamel Eddine Benšeiḫ*. Ed. F. Sanagustin. (Damas: Institut Français d'Etudes Arabes de Damas, 2001): 41–65.

[90] In the sense of Blachère and Gaudefroy-Demombynes, who state that in such complex sentences "*la subordonnée équivaut à un maṣdar et dépend d'une principale dont elle est complément*": R. Blachère, M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *Grammaire de l'arabe classique* (*morphologie et syntaxe*), 3e édition revue et remaniée (Paris: G.P. Maisonneuve et Larose, 1952), 452.

[91] "When the action of the subordinate clause is factual and completed the verb occurs in the perfect after *an*. This is one of the very limited number of occasions when *an* may be followed directly by anything other than the dependent imperfect form". S.M. al-Badawi, M.G. Carter, A. Gully, *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar* (London, New York: Routledge, 2004), 603.

[92] "The subjunctive is used in subordinate clauses after the following common conjunctions: *an* that, *allā* (or *an lā*) that not, *li-*, *kay*, *li-kay* and *li-an* so that, *kaylā*, *li-kaylā* and *li-allā* so that not, *ḥattā* until, so that": D. Cowan, *An Introduction to Modern Literary Arabic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), 93.

are non-dependent, and can be introduced or not by some particles. The domain to which these latter belong can be defined as 'virtual'.

The three domains—factual, conceptual, and virtual—contain expressions that range from the lowest degree of uncertainty ('factual uncertainty') to the highest degree of uncertainty ('virtual uncertainty'). Viewed from this angle, the verbal system of the Arabic language would represent 'certainty' (suffixed conjugation) as opposed to three different kind of 'uncertainty' (*yafʿal-u vs yafʿal-a/-ø*). Verbal forms contained in the conditional-hypothetical structure (i.e. *in yaqum yaqum*), representing 'contingent' propositions, would have the maximum degree of uncertainty.

As for the optative expressions (positive or negative), the suffixed verbal form by means of which they are construed would express 'certainty'. It is in fact the certainty of faith included in such expression as رحمه الله "May God have mercy on him" that psychologically differentiate optative propositions from suppositions and hypotheses; if not in faith, the psychological 'certainty' has to be found in one's expectations.[93]

Finally, as for the negative context, our opinion is that it should be distinguished in two domains. The domain of the 'external' negation being represented by the metanegation *mā faʿala* of a suffixed form *faʿala* or by the metanegation *mā yafʿalu* of a prefixed form *yafʿalu*, where *faʿala* and *yafʿalu* are positive predicates and *mā* is a modal operator assigning to the proposition a 'truth value' indicating the relation of the proposition to truth. When the modal operator *mā* is applied to propositions of the language, like *faʿala* and *yafʿalu*, it generates the propositions of the metalanguage *mā faʿala* (it is not true that *faʿala*) and *mā yafʿalu* (it is not true that *yafʿalu*).[94] If we eliminate the negation, we find the positive predicate of the language to which the metanegation is applied (*faʿala* or *yafʿalu*). The other domain is the domain of the internal negation, in which predicates are negative predicates. Being all equally 'uncertain' in the sense that they are 'unrealised'—with the only exception of optative ones which are seen as if they were 'realised'—all negative predicates are construed with *yafʿal-* forms: *lam yafʿal* is the internal negation of *faʿala*,

[93] "She knew that what Marianne and her mother conjectured one moment, they believed the next—that with them, to wish was to hope, and to hope was to expect": J. Austin, *Sense and Sensibility* (London: T. Egerton 1811, repr. 1970, London, Oxford University Press), 17. "*Con l'agile speme precorre l'evento*," A. Manzoni, *Adelchi* (1822).

[94] For a detailed discussion see Giolfo, "La particella *mā* nel sistema della negazione verbale in arabo classico: un'interpretazione sincronica," in P.G. Borbone, A. Mengozzi and M. Tosco (eds.), *Loquentes Linguis. Studi linguistici e orientali in onore di Fabrizio A. Pennacchietti*, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006), 307–317.

lā yafʿalu is the internal negation of *yafʿalu*, *lan yafʿala* is the internal negation of *sawfa/sa- yafʿalu*, *lā yafʿala* is the internal negation of *yafʿala*, *lā yafʿal/tafʿal* is the internal negation of *yafʿal*[95]*/ifʿal*.

References

Primary Sources

Aristoteles (B.C. 350). *Prior Analytics*. Translated by A.J. Jenkinson. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.
——, *Categoriae et Liber de interpretatione*. Edited by L. Minio-Paluello. London: Oxford University Press, 1949.
——, *Prior and posterior analytics*. Edited by W.D. Ross. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.
Astarābāḏī, Raḍī al-dīn (al-). *Šarḥ kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥājib*. 2 vols. Istanbul: Maṭbaʿat al-šarika al-ṣiḥāfiyya al-ʿuṯmāniyya, 1275 and 1310 H. [Repr. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, n.d.].
Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ ʿalā al-alfiyya*. Cairo: 1965.
——, *Šarḥ Ibn ʿAqīl ilā alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Edited by Ṭaha Muḥammad al-Zaynī. 4 vols. Cairo: ʾĪsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1966–1967.
Ibn al-Ḥājib. *al-Kāfiya*. In: Molla Jāmī. *al-Fawāʾid al-ḍiyāʾiyya, Molla Jāmī ʿalā al-Kāfiya*. Istanbul, n.d.
Ibn Hišām. *Muġnī al-labīb ʿan kutub al-aʿārīb.* Edited by Māzin al-Mubārak, Muḥammad ʿAlī Ḥamd Allāh and Saʿīd al-Afġānī. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1969.
Ibn Jinnī. *Kitāb al-lumaʿ fī al-naḥw*. Edited by Hadi M. Kechrida. Uppsala: 1976.
Sībawayhi, ʿAmr ibn ʿUṯmān. *Kitāb*, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Edited by H. Derenbourg. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag 1970), (2) edited by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. 5 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Qalam, 1966–1977.
Zamaḫšarī. *Kitāb al-mufaṣṣal fī al-naḥw*. Edited by J.P. Broch. Christianiae, 1859.
——, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī ʿilm al-ʿarabiyya*. Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, n.d.

Secondary Sources

Austin, J. *Sense and Sensibility.* London: T. Egerton 1811. [Repr. London: Oxford University Press, 1970].
Badawi, S.M. (al-), Carter, M.G. and Gully, A. *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
Blachère, R. and Gaudefroy-Demombynes, M. *Grammaire de l'arabe classique* (*morphologie et syntaxe*), 3e édition revue et remaniée. Paris: G. P. Maisonneuve et Larose, 1952.
Corriente, F. *Gramática árabe*. Madrid: Instituto Hispano Arabe de Cultura, 1980.
Cowan, D. *An Introduction to Modern Literary Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.
Dévényi, K. "The treatment of conditional sentences by medieval Arabic grammarians." *The Arabist* 1 (1988): 11–42.
Fischer, W. *Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1972.

[95] In constructions like *li-yafʿal*, but also in constructions like *in yafʿal* since, as already mentioned, in Koranic Arabic, with *in*, *lam yafʿal* is not the only negation, there is in fact also another negation: *lā yafʿal* (P. Larcher,"Les systèmes conditionnels en *in* de l'arabe classique." *Bulletin d'Études Orientales*, 58 (2009): 207ff), and with no exceptions *lā yafʿal* is the negative counterpart of *yafʿal* whilst *lam yafʿal* is the negative counterpart of *faʿala* (Larcher, "Les 'complexes de phrases' de l'arabe classique." *Kervan—International Journal of Afro-Asiatic Studies* 6 (2007): 35.

Giolfo, M.E.B. “Le strutture condizionali dell’arabo classico nella tradizione grammaticale araba e nella tradizione grammaticale europea.” *Kervan—International Journal of Afro-Asiatic Studies* 2 (2005): 55–79. url: www.kervan.unito.it.

——, “I sistemi condizionali in *in* dell’arabo classico: *in yafʿal vs in faʿala*, un’ipotesi modale.” Paper presented at the 12th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics, University of Ragusa, Italy, June 6–9, 2005. In *Atti del XII Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camito-semitica* (*Afroasiatica*), edited by M. Moriggi, 185–192. Catanzaro: Rubbettino, 2006.

——, “La particella *mā* nel sistema della negazione verbale in arabo classico: un’interpretazione sincronica.” In *Loquentes Linguis. Studi linguistici e orientali in onore di Fabrizio A. Pennacchietti*, edited by P.G. Borbone, A. Mengozzi and M. Tosco, 307–317. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.

——, “*in yaqum vs in qāma*: un’ipotesi modale.” *Kervan—International Journal of Afro-Asiatic Studies* 3 (2006): 17–34. url: www.kervan.unito.it.

Jahn, G. *Sībawaihi’s Buch über die Grammatik, Übersetzt und Erläutert von G. Jahn*. Berlin: 1894–95. [Repr. Hildesheim: 1969].

Kratzer, A. *Semantik der Rede, Kontexttheorie—Modalwörter—Konditionalsätze*. Scriptor, 1978.

Larcher, P. “Les ‘complexes de phrases’ de l’arabe classique.” *Kervan—International Journal of Afro-Asiatic Studies* 6 (2007): 29–45. url: www.kervan.unito.it.

——, “Les systèmes conditionnels en *in* de l’arabe classique.” *Bulletin d’Études Orientales* 58 (2009): 205–232.

Levin, A. “Sībawayhi’s view of the syntactic structure of *kāna wa-aḫawātu-hā*.” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 1 (1979): pp. 185–213. [Repr. in: A. Levin. *Arabic linguistic thought and dialectology*. Jerusalem: 1998].

Lewis, D.K. *Counterfactuals*. Oxford: 1973.

Łukasiewicz, J. *Modal Logic*. Warzawa: Polish Scientific Publishers, 1970.

Manzoni, A. *Adelchi*. 1822.

Massignon, L. “Le temps dans la pensée islamique.” *Eranos Jahrbuch* 20 (1952): 143–148.

Monteil, V. *L’arabe moderne*, Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1960.

Reckendorf, H. *Arabische Syntax*, Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1921. [2., unveränderte Auflage. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1977].

Roman, A. “Le temps dans la langue et la culture d’Arabie et d’Islam. Paroles, signes, mythes.” In *Mélanges offerts à Jamel Eddine Benšeiḫ*, edited by F. Sanagustin, 41–65. Damascus: Institut Français d’Etudes Arabes de Damas, 2001.

Veccia Vaglieri, L. *Grammatica teorico-pratica della lingua araba*. 2 vols. Roma: Istituto per l’Oriente, 1937.

Versteegh, K. “Two Conceptions of Irreality in Arabic Grammar: Ibn Hišām and Ibn al-Ḥājib on the particle *law*.” In *De la grammaire de l’Arabe aux grammaires des arabes*, edited by P. Larcher. Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1991, 77–92. [= *Bulletin d’Études Orientales* 43].

——, *The Arabic Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997.

Wright, W. *A grammar of the Arabic language*, translated from the German of Caspari, and edited [1859–1862] with numerous additions and corrections, 3rd ed., 2 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1896–98. [1st edition. 1859–1862; repr. Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1974, 2 vols in 1, Revised by W. Robertson Smith and M.J. de Goeje; preface, addenda and corrigenda by P. Cachia].

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE USAGE OF LAYSA IN THE QURʾĀN AND LAYSA IN SĪBAWAYHI'S KITĀB

Haruko Sakaedani

Introduction

Laysa in the *Qurʾān* is used to express 'do/does not exist' and 'am/are/is not.' *Laysa* which means "do/does not exist" commonly appears (41 of the 45 examples) as *laysa* "he/it does not exist" a masculine singular form, even if its subject is a feminine noun, especially when it is an indefinite one. As for *laysa* which means 'am/are/is not', its complement is accompanied by the preposition *bi-* "by, with" (24 of the 44 examples) much more than it becoming dependent (4 of the 44) in the *Qurʾān*, which marks different usage from Modern Standard Arabic. In fact, *laysa* negates imperfect verbs in Modern Standard Arabic to make an emphasized denial, which is never the case in the *Qurʾān*.

In this paper,[1] I would like to compare what is said about *laysa* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* with how *laysa* is used in the *Qurʾān*. I will investigate the common features and the differences in the way *laysa* is used in the *Qurʾānic* Arabic and in Modern Standard Arabic. I will approach these issues from two different angles. One will be a brief survey of Classical Arabic grammar books that will enable us to trace the changes in the way the Classical grammarians explain the usages of *laysa*. The second is a research into *laysa*'s diachronic changes from *Jāhili* verses, which reinforces the hypothesis that changes have occurred in the usage of *laysa*. Three questions will form the foci of this paper, namely whether the masculine form of *laysa* has been used consistently even when the subject of the verb is feminine. The second point concerns *laysa*'s predicate and the dependent case assigned to it and finally the origins of *laysa*'s role in negating imperfect verbs.

[1] This study was supported by the Global COE Program "Corpus-based Linguistics and Language Education" (CbLLE) of Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

1. *Laysa* in Modern Standard Arabic

The verb *laysa*, which means "not to be," negates predicates in the present tense without exception in spite of its perfect form. Badawi et al.[2] summarize the usage of *laysa* in Modern Standard Arabic as follows:

1. Usage with a dependent predicate:
   ولكن ليس الوضع خطيرا. "But the situation is not serious."
2. Usage when the predicate is a prepositional phrase:
   ليس للمصلحة العامة. "It is not for the general good."
3. Usage when the subject is indefinite:
   ليس لديه شيء جديد يقوله. "He has nothing new to say."[3]
   (*lit.* There is not for him anything new to say.)
4. Usage with a predicate comprising *bi-* (predicate may be either indefinite or definite, and either noun or adjective):
   وهو ليس بشاهد أو بقارئ. "While he is not one who witnessed [it] or read [it]."
5. Usage with a predicate comprising a partitive *min*:
   إذ ليس من حركة ثورية. "Since there is no revolutionary movement."
6. Usage as a compound negative:
   لستُ أقيم في هذا المنزل. "I do not live in this house."
7. Usage as a negative conjugation:
   هو شعب مصر، ليس حكومةُ مصر. "It is the people of Egypt, not the government of Egypt."
8. Usage as *laysa ʾillā* "except" or *laysa ġayru* "no others", either of which when placed at the end of a noun-phrase or sentence means "nothing more" "nothing else" or "nothing but":
   خطوة تمهيد ليس إلا "a preparatory step, nothing else"
   أريد محبتك ليس غير. "I want your love, nothing else."

The above mentioned usage of *laysa* is classified into four large groups.

[2] E. Badawi, M.G. Carter and A. Gully, *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar* (London: Routledge, 2004), 417–418; 477–481.
[3] Lit. There is not for him anything new to say.

i. the *laysa* that means (Subject) is not (Complement) (this class encompasses categories 1–5 above). The complement in question may be a noun phrase, a prepositional phrase, or an adjective.
ii. the *laysa* that negates imperfect verbs (category 6 above).
iii. the *laysa* that is used as a negative conjugation (category 7 above).
iv. the *laysa ʾillā* and *laysa ġayru* that mean "nothing more," "nothing else," or "nothing but" when placed at the end of a noun-phrase or sentence (category 8 above).

2. Laysa *in the* Qurʾān

In this section, we shall see how *laysa* is used in the *Qurʾān*. According to ʿAbdu l-Bāqī[4] and Baʿlabakkī,[5] *laysa* and its conjugated forms appear in the *Qurʾān* as follows:

Table 1

laysa	74 times
laysati	3 times
laysū	2 times
lasta	4 times
lastu	2 times
lastum	3 times
lastunna	1 time
total	89 times

Badawi and Abdel Haleem[6] have the following to say about *laysa* in the *Qurʾān*:

> a word denoting negation, 'not', and occurring 89 times in the Qur'an. Grammarians describe it as a conjugable verb, occurring only in the perfect, and classify it amongst the sister of *kāna* (أخوات كان) . . . , all of which govern a nominal sentence with the subject in the nominal case and the predicate in the accusative. . . . Preposition بـ is often prefixed to the predicate of *laysa* (ليس) for particular emphasis . . .

[4] M.F. ʿAbdu-l-Bāqī, *al-Muʿjam al-mufahris li-ʾalfāẓ al-Qurʾān al-Karīm* (Beirut: Dār al-Maʿarifa, 1994).

[5] R. Baʿlabakkī, *al-Mawrid al-mufahris li-ʾalfāẓ al-Qurʾān al-Karīm* (Beirut: Dār al-ʿIlm li-l-Malālīn, 1999).

[6] E. Badawi and M. Abdel Haleem, *Arabic-English Dictionary of Qura'nic Usage* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 859.

Namely, they opine that *laysa* neither negates imperfect verbs, nor works as a negative conjugation, nor means "nothing more" in the *Qurʾān*. Actually, Sakaedani[7] analyzed the text of the *Qurʾān*, and found that other than two, all of the instances of *laysa* usage fall under the first category of *laysa* usage mentioned in the previous section, i.e. "i. the *laysa* that states that (Subject) is not (Complement)." The other two examples include the word *ʾillā*, which means "except," and no subject appears in them: أولئك الذين ليس لهم في الآخرة إلا النار (Q 11:16) "[S]uch people will have nothing in the Hereafter but the Fire"[8] and ليس للإنسان إلا ما سعى (Q 53:39) "[M]an will only have what he has worked towards".[9]

According to Sakaedani,[10] the breakdown of the instances of *laysa* found in the *Qurʾān* is as follows. The numbers of the chapters and verses in which *laysa* appears have been placed within parentheses:

Table 2

Subject / Predicate	definite noun phrase	indefinite noun phrase
definite noun phrase	None	none
bi+definite noun phrase / adjective phrase	*laysa* (4:123), (6:30), (6:53), (29:10), (46:34), (58:10), (95:8) 7 times *lastu* (7:172) 1 time *lastum* (2:267) 1 time total 9 times	none
indefinite noun phrase / adjective phrase	*laysa* (11:8) 1time *lasta* (4:94), (13:43) 2 times *laysū* (3:113) 1 time total 4 times	none
bi+indefinite noun phrase / adjective phrase	*laysa* (3:182), (5:116), (6:122), (8:51), (11:81), (22:10), (36:81), (39:36), (39:37), (46:32 the fast	*laysū* (6:89) 1 time

[7] Haruko Sakaedani, "Kōran ni okeru hitēdōši laisa no yōhō," *Kōpasu ni Motodzuku Gengogaku Kyōiku Kenkyū Hōkoku* 4 (2010), 259–276.

[8] Translation by M.A.S. Abdel Haleem, *The Qur'an* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). Literally the verse reads: Those for whom [thing] is not in the Hereafter but the Fire.

[9] Lit. [thing] is not for man except he has worked toward.

[10] Sakaedani, "Kōran ni okeru hitēdōši laisa no yōhō," 265 and 273.

Table 2 (*cont.*)

	half), (75:40) 11 times *lasta* (88:22) 1 time *lastu* (6:66) 1 time *lastum* (15:20) 1 time total 14 times	
preposition (except *bi-*) + definite noun phrase	*laysa* (2:249), (2:272), (3:28), (3:36), (3:167), (11:46 the first half), (43:51), (48:11) 8 times *laysati* (4:18) 1 time *lasta* (6:159) 1 time total 10 times	*laysa* (2:282), (3:66), (3:75), (3:128), (4:176), (5:93), (6:51), (6:70), (7:61), (7:67), (9:91), (11:46 the latter half), (11:47), (11:78), (15:42), (16:99), (17:36), (17:65), (22:71), (24:15), (24:58), (29:8), (29:68), (31:15), (33:5), (39:32), (39:60), (40:42), (40:43), (42:11), (46:32 the latter half), (48:17), (53:58), (56:2), (69:35), (70:2), (88:6) 37 times Subject is not mentioned: (11:16), (53:39), 2 times
preposition (except *bi-*) + indefinite noun phrase	*lastum* (5:68) 1 time *laysati* (2:113)×2 2 times *lastunna* (33:32) 1 time total 4 times	none
'an clause	*laysa* (2:177) 1 time	laysa (2:198), (4:101), (24:29), (24:60), (24:61)×2 6 times
bi-'an clause	*laysa* (2:189) 1 time	none

3. *LAYSA* IN SĪBAWAYHI'S *KITĀB*

3.1 *Negations in Sībawayhi's* Kitāb

First, as regards the negation of verbs, Sībawayhi has summarized how to negate verbs in باب نفي الفعل[11] as shown in the following chart. However,

[11] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 259 (1) ed. H. Derenbourg (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881) 1, 408–409, (2) ed. ʿA.S.M. Hārūn ([Cairo]: Dār al-Qalam, 1966–1977).

he has made no mention here about either *laysa* + *yafʿalu* (compound negative) or *laysa* itself. Nevertheless, he has stated in another section[12] that *laysa* indicates negation.

Table 3

Affirmative	Negation
faʿala	*lam yafʿal*
qad faʿala	*lammā yafʿal*
laqad faʿala	*mā faʿala*
yafʿalu (in the actual situation)	*mā yafʿalu*
yafʿalu (the action was not actual)	*lā yafʿalu*
layafʿalanna	*lā yafʿalu*
sawfa yafʿalu	*lan yafʿala*

3.2 *Is* laysa *a Verb or a Particle?*

In order to answer this question, I will present Sībawayhi's view first, followed by other Arab grammarians' view as represented by Ibn Yaʿīš.

3.2.1. *Sībawayhi's View*

There are two views regarding *laysa*: "*laysa* is a verb" and "*laysa* is a particle." In traditional grammar, the concept of *laysa* is explained by comparing it with the particles *lā* and *mā*.

Sībawayhi says that *laysa* is a verb and to illustrate his point, he points out that in the section of ما جرى من الأسماء التي من الأفعال وما أشبهها,[13] *laysa* governs its subject and predicate—in particular in a line of a poem found therein: أليس أكرم خلق الله قد علموا عند الحفاظ بنو عمرٍ بن حنجود "Is not Banū ʿAmr bin Ḥunjūd the most honorable creatures of Allāh, as they [the people] knew, as for preserving the honor." Sībawayhi says that the *laysa* in this line is placed similarly to its position in ضرب قومَك بنو فلانٍ "So-and-so family hit your tribe," since *laysa* is a verb.[14]

---

[12] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 508, Derenbourg 2, 338/Hārūn 4, 233.
[13] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 111, Derenbourg 1, 201–206/Hārūn 2, 37–49.
[14] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 201/Hārūn 2, 37.

3.2.2. *Other Grammarians' View*

As mentioned above, *laysa* is explained in traditional grammar in comparison with *lā* and *mā*. Ibn Yaʿīš, for instance, gives examples of the al-Ḥijāz people in whose dialect *mā* makes its predicate a dependent case, as does *laysa* in the section of اسم لا وما المشتبهتين بليس:[15] ما هذا بشراً (Q 12:31) "He (Yūṣuf) cannot be mortal!" and ما هن أمهاتِهم (Q 58:2) "[T]hey are not their mothers".

However, the action of *mā* on a predicate is weaker than the action of *laysa* on the same, and thus the predicate does not become dependent when the predicate precedes the subject or when an exception particle appears between the subject and the predicate: وما محمد إلا رسول (3:144) "Muhammad is only a messenger".[16]

Therefore, Ibn Yaʿīš opines that *laysa* is a verb and *mā* is a particle. Ibn Hišām picks up *laysa* as one of the examples of a verb as it accepts the inflectional ending –*t* for the perfect form of the third person feminine singular, like قامت "she stood up," قعدت "she sat." He gives some other examples like نِعْمَ "what an excellent ...!," بِئْسَ "what a bad ...!," and أسعى "it could be that ...".[17] Ohalla, on the other hand, summarizes his reasons for regarding *laysa* as a verb as follows:[18]

1. It triggers dependent case on nominal and adjectival predicates.
2. It inflects for tense-agreement and enters into agreement with the subject.
3. It occupies the initial position immediately before the subject usually reserved for the verb in the canonical order VSO.

3.3 Bi- *Attached to* laysa's *Predicate*

In the context of the usage of *laysa* in the *Qurʾān*, Badawi and Abdel Haleem say that preposition *bi-* is often prefixed to the predicate of *laysa* for particular emphasis,[19] as has been detailed in Section 2.

As for this preposition *bi-* added to the predicate, Sībawayhi says that there is no difference between the existence of *bi-* and absence of *bi-*.[20] He

15 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* (Beirut: ʿĀlam al-Kutub) 1, 108.
16 Lit. Muhammad is not [anything] but a messenger.
17 Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ Šuḏūr al-Ḏahab* (Bierut: al-Maktaba al-ʿAṣriyya), 20.
18 J. Ohalla, "Negation," in *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, ed. K. Versteegh (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 3, 355.
19 Badawi and Abdel Haleem, *Arabic-English Dictionary of Qura'nic Usage*, 859.
20 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 20, Derenbourg 1, 25–26/Hārūn 1, 67–68.

supports his claim by quoting an expression found in ʿUqayba al-ʾAsadī's poem: فلسنا بالجبال ولا الحديد "And we are neither the mountains nor the iron". He says that adding bi- to the predicate *al-jibāl* "the mountains" does not cause any change in its meaning as both حسبُك هذا and بِحسبِك هذا mean "this is enough for you." Ibn Yaʿīš[21] also says that *bi-* is added to ensure negation, but the addition causes no change in the meaning.

Thus, in their investigative accounts on the topic of whether the preposition *bi-* is added to predicates "for particular emphasis," the concerned grammarians have not put forth an affirmative view. Furthermore, as shown in Table 2, when a predicate is a definite noun phrase, the preposition *bi-* is always added to it. Moreover, the dependent predicates without a preposition total only 4, while the prepositional phrase predicates with the preposition *bi-* are 23 (4:123 is excluded, as here, *bi-* means "by" or "according to;" that is, if *bi-* is removed from this verse, its meaning changes). In other words, predicates comprising the preposition *bi-* appear much more often in the *Qurʾān* than predicates without it. Thus, it cannot be described as "particular."

However, when the predicate is a *ʾan* clause, it is only once that the *ʾan* clause attached with *bi-* appears in the *Qurʾān*, while seven *ʾan* clauses without *bi-* appear in the same. This fact turns the table, but even so, as regards the total amount, the predicates with *bi-* (24 examples) far exceed in number the predicates without *bi-* (13 examples).

3.4 *Ellipsis of* ḍamīr al-šaʾn *"Pronoun of the Matter"*

Sībawayhi talks about the *laysa* that contains an ellipsis of *ḍamīr al-šaʾn* "pronoun of the matter."[22] He gives the following examples of *ḍamīr al-šaʾn* "pronoun of the matter":[23] إنه من يأتنا نأته "We come to whoever comes to us"[24] and وإنه أمة الله ذاهبةٌ "Allāh's maidservant is going".[25]

---

[21] Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* 2, 114. He cites the following two verses as examples of Qurʾānic verses:

أليس الله بكافٍ عبده (39:36) "Is God not enough for His servant?"

ألستُ بربكم (7:172) "Am I not your Lord?"

He explains that the former means أليس الله كافيًا عبدَه and the latter means ألستُ ربّكم.

[22] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*, chapter 21, Derenbourg 1, 27–28/Hārūn 1, 69–72.

[23] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 27/Hārūn 1, 69.

[24] Lit. It is that whoever comes to us, we come to him.

[25] Lit. It is that Allāh's maidservant is going.

According to Sībawayhi,[26] some Arabs say, ليس خلق الله مثلَه "Allāh did not create [anyone] like him".[27] He further states that if this *laysa* had no ellipsis, the verb خلق "(he) created" could not have appeared, and neither could *laysa* have governed a noun. Sībawayhi also cites a verse of Ḥumaid al-'Araqaṭ as an example:[28] فأصبحوا والنوى عالي معرَّسِهم، وليس كلَّ النوى تُلقي المساكين "And they [the starving guests] met the morning, the date pits being piled up beside their night's lodging, but the miserable did not throw away all the date pits [as they were so hungry]."[29]

If *laysa* governed *kulla* it might not take the dependent but the nominal case because *laysa* might not contain an ellipsis of *ḍamīr al-šaʾn* "pronoun of the matter." In point of fact, *kulla* takes the dependent case because of the verb *tulqī*, which means "they throw" (*lit.* she throws). Another example is given.[30] Hišām 'Aḫūḏī al-Rumma composed the following: هي الشفاء لدائي لو ظفرتُ بها، وليس منها شفاء الداء مبذول "It might be the cure of my disease if I got the better of it, but no cure of the disease is given by it."[31]

Sībawayhi provides an explanation regarding these lines in another section,[32] as also about the following expressions including *ḍamīr al-šaʾn* "pronoun of the matter" that are permitted: ليس خلق الله أشعر منه "Allāh did not create a more famous poet than he",[33] and ليس قالها زيد "Zayd did not say it".[34] Such *laysa* that contains an ellipsis of *ḍamīr al-šaʾn* "pronoun of the matter" is never found in the *Qurʾān*. Sībawayhi does not give an example of the *Qurʾānic* verse, either.

3.5 *Expressing Exceptions*

Sībawayhi says that *laysa* is used to show exceptions in a manner similar to *lā yakūnu*.[35] He gives some examples to illustrate his point as in: ما أتاني القوم ليس زيداً.[36] "The people came to me except Zayd" *vs* وأتوني لايكون زيداً[37]

[26] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 21, Derenbourg 1, 27/Hārūn 1, 70.
[27] Lit. It is not that Allāh created [someone] like him.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Lit. And it is not that all the date pits that the miserable throw.
[30] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 21, Derenbourg 1, 27/Hārūn 1, 71.
[31] Lit. And it is not that cure of the disease is given from it.
[32] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 34, Derenbourg 1, 62/Hārūn 1, 147.
[33] Lit. It is not that Allāh created a more famous poet than he.
[34] Lit. It is not that Zayd said it.
[35] Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 202, Derenbourg 1, 328–329/Hārūn 2, 347–350.
[36] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 328/Hārūn 2, 347.
[37] Ibid.

"and they came to me except Zayd" and وما أتاني أحدٌ لا يكون زيدًا[38] "and no one came to me except Zayd", and ما أتتني امرأة ليست فلانةً:[39] "No woman came to me except so-and-so" *vs* ما أتتني امرأة لا تكون فلانةً[40] "No woman came to me except so-and-so".

Sībawayhi also says that when the object is a pronoun, it is prefixed by *ʾīyā-* to become a separate personal pronoun in the dependent, such as the following: ليت هذا الليلَ شهرُ لا نرى فيه عريبا، ليس إيايَ وأياك ولا نخشى رقيبا[41] "I wish this night were one month, in which we do not see anyone, except me and you, and we do not fear a guardian". He also mentions hearing the Arabs saying *laysa-nī*, which means "except me," too.[42] In other words, the object may be a suffixed pronoun in the dependent. Although other grammarians too talk about this type of *laysa*, however, there is no example of *laysa* that denotes "exception" in the *Qurʾān*.

Of course, there are verses that include an expression of exception, but there is no verse in which *laysa* is used to denote "except." Some verses that include *laysa* and *ʾillā* or *min dūni* to show the meaning "not. . .but" can be found, as we saw in Section 2 and as in أولئك الذين ليس لهم في الآخرة إلا النار (Q.11:16) "Such people will have nothing in the Hereafter but the Fire" and ليس للإنسان إلا ما سعى (Q. 53:39) "[M]an will only have what he has worked towards". Further, verses (Q. 6:51), (Q. 6:70), (Q. 46:32, the first half) and (Q. 53:58) use *min dūni* instead of *ʾillā*. For example: ليس لهم من دونه ولي ولا شفيع (6:51) "[T]hey will have no one but Him to protect them and no one to intercede."

Conclusion

In this study, we investigated the usage of *laysa* in the *Qurʾān* and the description of *laysa* by the traditional grammarians, especially Sībawayhi. Our findings are listed below.

First, compound negative, i.e. the negation of imperfect verbs by *laysa* that is observed in Modern Standard Arabic, is not mentioned by Sībawayhi and other grammarians. Furthermore, there is no example of compound

38 Ibid.
39 Ibid.
40 Ibid.
41 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 207, Derenbourg 1, 333/Hārūn 2, 358.
42 Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 333/Hārūn 2, 359.

negative in the *Qurʾān.* The said usage is supposed to be relatively recent, as it not found in the *Qurʾānic* Arabic. Consequently, a diachronic study is needed to investigate this change.

Secondly, the preposition *bi-* is often used as *laysa*'s predicate, especially noun phrases rather than *ʾan* clauses, in the *Qurʾān*, although Sībawayhi says such usage does not cause any change in meaning. The usage and disuse of the preposition *bi-* also warrants a diachronic study on the Arabic language.

Third, Sībawayhi points out *ḍamīr al-šaʾn* "pronoun of the matter" is involved in the verb *laysa*; however, this kind of *laysa* cannot be found in the *Qurʾān* but in *Jāhili* poetry and other Arab utterances.

Fourth, Sībawayhi and other grammarians show that *laysa* means "except" in expressions of exception, although such usage of *laysa* is not found in the *Qurʾān*.

Although both *ḍamīr al-šaʾn* of the verb *laysa* and the *laysa* of exception are described in *Kitāb Sībawayhi*, they are not used in the *Qurʾān.* Even though the purpose of the traditional grammar is to protect the accurate version of the Arabic language to facilitate an exact reading of the *Qurʾān*, the grammarians have described some grammatical items that are not found the *Qurʾān.* Such items should be older than the *Qurʾānic* Arabic. Therefore, other texts—like *Jāhili* poetry—should be investigated.

References

Primary Sources

Ibn Hišām, ʿAbdu Allāh bn Yūsuf. (d. 1390 h). *Šarḥ šuḏūr al-Ḏahab*. Beirut: al-Maktaba al-ʿAṣriyya, n.d.

Ibn Yaʿīš, Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū l-Baqāʾ (d. 643 h). *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal.* Beirut: ʿĀlam al-Kutub. n.d., (ten volumes bound together in two volumes).

Sībawayhi, ʿAmr ibn ʿUṯmān. *Kitāb*, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Edited by H. Derenbourg. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag 1970), (2) edited by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. 5 vols. [Cairo]: Dār al-Qalam, 1966–1977.

Secondary Sources

Abdel Haleem, M.A.S. *The Qur'an*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

ʿAbdu-l-Bāqī, M.F. *al-Muʿjam al-mufahris li-ʾalfāẓ al-Qurʾān al-Karīm*. Beirut: Dār al-Maʿarifa, 1994.

Badawi, E., Carter, M.G. and Gully, A. *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London, and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Badawi, E. and Abdel Haleem, M. *Arabic-English Dictionary of Qura'nic Usage*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Baʿlabakkī, R. *al-Mawrid al-mufahris li-ʾalfāẓ al-Qurʾān al-Karīm*. Beirut: Dār al-ʿIlm li-l-Malālīn, 1999.

Ohalla, J. "Negation." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, edited by K. Versteegh. Vol. 3, 355–360. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Sakaedani, Haruko. 2010. "Kōran ni okeru hitēdōši laisa no yōhō." In *Kōpasu ni Motodzuku Gengogaku Kyōiku Kenkyū Hōkoku* 4. 259–276. Tokyo: Global COE Program, 'Corpus-based Linguistics and Language Education' (CbLLE), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Versteegh, K. (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, Volume III. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

THE MOOD OF THE VERB FOLLOWING *ḤATTĀ*, ACCORDING TO MEDIEVAL ARAB GRAMMARIANS

Arik Sadan

Introduction

The mood of the imperfect verb following the particle *ḥattā* is one of the more complicated subjects in Arabic grammar. This paper focuses on one critical aspect concerning the usage of an imperfect verb after *ḥattā*: the relationship between the time that such a verb conveys and its mood, 'indicative' (*marfūʿ*) or 'subjunctive' (*manṣūb*). It consists of three parts:

Part one is a short introduction on the preoccupation of medieval Arab grammarians with the particle *ḥattā*. Part two examines the main theories of Sībawayhi, on the one hand, and of later grammarians, such as al-Zamaḫšarī, on the other, regarding the time of an imperfect verb following *ḥattā*. Finally part three is a discussion of al-Astarābāḏī's proposal, that the mood of the verb following *ḥattā* is related not only to the time it conveys but also to the speaker's intention.

1. The Preoccupation of Medieval Arab Grammarians with the Particle *Ḥattā*

Medieval Arab grammarians' preoccupation with *ḥattā* is due to the many syntactic and semantic contexts in which it can be used: it can be a subordinating particle followed by a verb, a preposition followed by a noun in the oblique case, and a conjunction meaning 'and even'. The famous grammarian al-Farrā' expressed his frustration concerning *ḥattā* and its complexity in the following words: أموت و في نفسي من حتّى شيء "I shall die, while in my soul there is something [obscure] regarding *ḥattā*".[1]

[1] See al-Fīrūzābādī, *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ* (Beirut, 1987) 1, 192a. This sentence is also quoted by al-Kaffawī, *al-Kulliyyāt: Muʿjam fī l-muṣṭalaḥāt wal-furūq al-luġawiyya* (Beirut, 1992), 395a; al-Zabīdī, *Šarḥ al-qāmūs al-musammā tāj al-ʿarūs min jawāhir al-qāmūs* (Beirut, 1994) 3, 36a; B. al-Bustānī, *Muḥīṭ al-muḥīṭ: Qāmūs muṭawwal lil-luġa l-ʿarabiyya* (Beirut, 1870) 1, 341b.

Although *ḥattā* has been discussed extensively in the scholarly literature, it is my impression that it is still unclear when the verb following *ḥattā* in Classical Arabic should be *marfūʿ* and when it should be *manṣūb*, according to the views of Sībawayhi and the grammarians who follow him.

2. The Main Theories of Sībawayhi and of Later Grammarians, such as al-Zamaḫšarī

Medieval Arab grammarians' discussions of *ḥattā* pay considerable attention to the question of the mood of the following imperfect verb. In his famous *al-Kitāb*, Sībawayhi presents a complex theory regarding *ḥattā* and its different meanings when it is followed by a verb in the *naṣb* or in the *rafʿ* mood.[2] He posits four different sentence types in which an imperfect verb follows *ḥattā*, two in which the verb is *manṣūb*, and two in which it is *marfūʿ*. For only three of these does Sībawayhi explicitly mention the time that the verb following *ḥattā* conveys. The following is a short description of these four types, including the examples that Sībawayhi gives for each.

a. In the first sentence type where the verb after *ḥattā* takes the *naṣb* mood, *ḥattā* has the meaning of 'until' (*ʾilā ʾan*) and the following verb signifies the 'the final point' (*ġāya*) of the domain of the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā*.[3] An example of this pattern is the sentence سرت حتّى أدخلَها "I went until the point of entering[4] it", in which the action of entering,

---

[2] Sībawayhi's theory concerning *ḥattā* is presented in chapters 238–240 of *al-Kitāb* (see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* (1) ed. H. Derenbourg [Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9] 1, 367–372, (2) ed. ʿA.S.M. Hārūn [Cairo, 1988] 3, 16–27). In chapter 238 Sībawayhi elucidates the different usages of the imperfect verb following *ḥattā* (these will be presented below), in chapter 239 he discusses more complex structures of *ḥattā* and chapter 240 is dedicated to sentences in which the agent of the verb preceding *ḥattā* differs from the agent of the following verb.

[3] According to E.W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (London, 1863–1893), 6, 2312a, the meaning of the term *ġāya* is "the utmost, or extreme, extent, term, limit, point, or reach; or the extremity; of a thing". Ibn Yaʿīš explains the term *ġāya* in the context of *ḥattā* in the following words: والمراد بالغاية أن يكون ما قبلها من الفعل متّصلا بها حتّى يقع هذا الفعل الذي بعدها في منتهاه "the intention in the [term] *ġāya* is that the action of the verb preceding it occurs continuously until the occurrence of the action of the verb following it, in its ending point (i.e. the ending point of the action of the verb preceding it)". See Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ Ibn Jaʿīś Commentar zu Zamachśarī's Mufaṣṣal*, ed. G. Jahn (Leipzig, 1886) 2, 929/Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal*, ed. A.S. Aḥmad and I.ʿA.J. ʿAbd al-Ġanī (Cairo, 2001) 3, 248.

[4] The examples in which the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *naṣb* should be translated using a gerund and not a conjugated verb (in this example: "until the point of entering"

expressed by the verb أدخلَها, is considered the final point of the domain of the action of going, expressed by the verb سرت. The sentence سرت إلى أن أدخلَها has the same meaning.[5] Sībawayhi states that there is a similarity between a noun and a verb which follow *ḥattā*: when they indicate the *ġāya*, the noun takes the oblique case and the verb takes the *naṣb*.[6] He adds that this observation is due to al-Ḫalīl.[7]

---

and not "until I have entered"). The reason for this way of translation is the fact that a *manṣūb* verb following *ḥattā* merely represents the idea that this verb is expected to occur, but its actual occurrence is not certain, that is, it might occur in reality but it might also not occur. Concerning this idea, see §3 below. For other sources that express this view, see H. L. Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften* (Leipzig, 1885–1888), 2.1, 84, where he criticizes Trumpp's translation of the sentence سرت حتّى أدخلَ البلد as "ich ging zu, bis dass ich in die Stadt kam" (see E. Trumpp, *Einleitung in das Studium der arabischen Grammatiker: die Ajrumiyyah* [*sic*] *des Muhammad bin Daūd: arabischer text mit Uebersetzung und Erläuterungen von Ernst Trumpp* (Munich, 1876), 36); but this translation, says Fleischer, fits the sentence سرت حتّى دخلت البلد, whereas the translation of the former sentence should reflect the intention of the speaker to arrive at the city and not the fact that he has indeed arrived. Therefore, Fleischer translates the sentence سرت حتّى أدخلَ البلد in three ways, which reflect this idea: "ich ging zu, bis dass ich in die Stadt käme/zu dem Ende, in die Stadt zu kommen/in der Absicht, so lange zu gehen, bis ich in die Stadt kommen würde". See further U. Mosel, *Die syntaktische Terminologie bei Sībawaih* (Munich, 1975), 2, 48, who translates Sībawayhi's example in a similar way to Fleischer's translation: "Ich bin mit dem Ziel, sie zu betreten, gereist" and explicitly says that in this sentence it is unknown if this goal (i.e. entering the city) has in fact been achieved or not; R. Talmon, "*Ḥattā* + Imperfect and chapter 239 in Sībawayhi's Kitāb: A study in the early history of Arabic Grammar" *Journal of Semitic Studies* 38 (1993): 73, who also translates this sentence without a conjugated verb: "I travelled up to the point of entry to it (viz., to the city)". Lane, on the other hand, translates this example by "I journeyed until I entered it" (see Lane, *Lexicon* 2, 509b). This translation, which is similar to Trumpp's translation mentioned above, does not fit the *manṣūb* verb following *ḥattā*, as explained above.

[5] See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 238, Derenbourg 1, 367/Hārūn 3, 17.

[6] In both cases *ḥattā* is considered a preposition (*ḥarf jarr*), but only when it appears before a noun does it influence it syntactically (causing it to take the oblique case), whereas when it appears before a verb in *naṣb*, Sībawayhi and most of the grammarians posit 'an *ʾan* concealed in the mind of the speaker' (*ʾan muḍmara*) which influences the verb syntactically (causing it to take the *naṣb* mood). This *ʾan* is thus considered to be the *ʿāmil* of the *manṣūb* verb after *ḥattā* and other prepositions, such as *li-*, and also after conjunctions, such as *fa-* and *wa-*. The main reason for this theory lies in the important theoretical principle of العامل له اختصاص "the *ʿāmil* has a uniqueness," i.e. it can either affect the mood of the imperfect verb or the case of a noun, but not both simultaneously. Therefore, a word which is considered to be a preposition, such as *ḥattā* and *li-*, can only be an *ʿāmil* of nouns and not of imperfect verbs. For Sībawayhi's view concerning the case of *li-* and *ḥattā*, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 234, Derenbourg 1, 362/Hārūn 3, 5–6. Cf. al-Šantamarī's commentary in al-Šantamarī, *al-Nukat fī tafsīr kitāb Sībawayhi*, ed. Z.ʿA.M. Sulṭān (Kuwait, 1987) 1, 700.

[7] See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 238, Derenbourg 1, 367/Hārūn 3, 17.

b. In the second sentence type where the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *naṣb* mood, *ḥattā* has the meaning of ‘in order to’ (*kay*) and the action of the verb after *ḥattā* has not yet occurred. An example of this pattern is the sentence كلّمته حتّى يأمرَ لي بشيء “I spoke to him in order that he would command [to bring] me something”. Sībawayhi adds that the verb يأمرَ in this sentence indicates an action which has not yet occurred and that the sentence كلّمته كي يأمرَ لي بشيء has the same meaning.[8] It is interesting to note that except for this short explanation, Sībawayhi does not elaborate on this sentence type, neither in this chapter (238) nor in the next two chapters devoted to *ḥattā*. Perhaps this is related to the essential difference between this type and the other three uses of *ḥattā* followed by an imperfect verb: this is the only case in which the verb following *ḥattā* necessarily indicates an action which has not yet occurred, i.e. in a future time relevant to the time of speech. In this case, the *naṣb* mood following *ḥattā* is perhaps easier to grasp, as it is considered to be caused by ‘an *ʾan* concealed in the mind of the speaker’ (*ʾan muḍmara*), which is ‘a sign of the future’ (*ʿalam al-istiqbāl*).[9]

c. In the first sentence type where the verb after *ḥattā* takes the *rafʿ* mood, the action of the verb following *ḥattā* takes place immediately after the action of the verb that precedes *ḥattā*. In addition, both actions must have taken place in the past. An example of this sentence type is سرت حتّى أدخلُها “I went and indeed I entered it”.[10] This sentence conveys the fact that there was an action of entering which occurred immediately after the action of going. In addition, it is understood that these two actions occurred in the past. Sībawayhi continues by comparing the example quoted above to the sentence سرت فأدخلُها “I went and I entered it”, because in both of them the action of entering, expressed using a verb in the *rafʿ* mood, occurred immediately after the action of going.[11] Finally,

---

[8] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 367/Hārūn 3, 17. Cf. al-Fārisī, *al-Taʿlīqa ʿalā kitāb Sībawayhi*, ed. ʿA. b. Ḥ. al-Qūzī (Cairo, 1990–1996) 3, 136.

[9] Regarding this point, see footnote 6 above and al-Astarābāḏī’s view, presented in §3 below.

[10] From two explicit remarks by Sībawayhi, it is inferred that the two actions must have taken place in the past. For these remarks, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* Derenbourg 1, 368, 16–17 and 368, 10–13/Hārūn 3, 20, 8–10 and 20, 1–4.

[11] Ibid., Derenbourg 1, 367/Hārūn 3, 17. Further in this chapter (see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* Derenbourg 1, 368/Hārūn 3, 20), Sībawayhi clarifies that the comparison made here between *ḥattā* and *fa-* is only meant to show that in both cases the two actions occurred sequentially in the past, but it certainly does not mean that the meaning of *ḥattā* is the same as the meaning of *fa-*. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* 1, 701–702; 707.

he determines that *ḥattā* here becomes like *ʾiḏā* and the other *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ*,[12] because in this pattern *ḥattā* does not have the meaning of *ʾilā ʾan* or *kay*, and therefore no longer belongs to the category of particles causing the verb to take the *naṣb*.[13]

d. In the second sentence type where the verb after *ḥattā* takes the *rafʿ* mood, the action of the verb after *ḥattā* does not occur immediately after the action of the verb before *ḥattā*. Also, the action of the verb before *ḥattā* must have taken place in the past, whereas the action of the verb after *ḥattā* occurs in the present.[14] Often the appropriate translation of *ḥattā* in this case is "so … that" or "such … that", as in the following examples which Sībawayhi gives for this pattern: لقد سرت حتّى أدخلُها ما أُمنع "I went [so much] that I can enter it, without anyone preventing me [from doing so]"; لقد رأى منّي عاما أوّل شيئا حتّى لا أستطيعُ أن أُكلّمه العام بشيء "he experienced from me[15] last year such a thing, that I cannot speak with him this year about anything"; مرض حتّى لا يرجونه "he was so sick, that they (i.e. the people) lose hope regarding him".[16] Sībawayhi clarifies that in this pattern, as well in the preceding one, the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *rafʿ* mood exactly as the noun takes the *rafʿ* case in the pattern in which it follows *ḥattā*, because in these patterns *ḥattā* is one of the *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ*.[17]

[12] The technical term *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ* refers to particles which do not affect the *ʾiʿrāb* of the sentences following them, such as *ʾinnamā*, a particle followed by the subject of a nominal sentence, which takes the *rafʿ* case due to the influence of the *ʿāmil* named *al-ibtidāʾ*. Sībawayhi's intention here is to clarify that in this pattern, *ḥattā* does not serve as an *ʿāmil* which syntactically affects the word following it. It should be indicated that Jahn, in his translation of *al-Kitāb*, is mistaken in translating the technical term *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ* here as "the particles appearing at the beginning of the sentence". See G. Jahn, *Sībawaihi's Buch über die Grammatik, übersetzt und erklärt von Dr. G. Jahn* (Berlin, 1895), 1.2, 141.

[13] See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* Derenbourg 1, 367/Hārūn 3, 17–18.

[14] There are two differences between the two sentence types in which the verb following *ḥattā* takes *rafʿ* (c and d above): in the former the two actions are sequential and both must have taken place in the past, whereas in the latter the two actions are not sequential and the second is taking place in the present. For Sībawayhi's thorough explanations of these differences, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* Derenbourg 1, 368/Hārūn 3, 19–20.

[15] Lane, *Lexicon* 1, 998b: رأى منه شيئا "he experienced from him such a thing".

[16] See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* Derenbourg 1, 367 and 368/Hārūn 3, 18 and 20.

[17] See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* Derenbourg 1, 367/Hārūn 3, 18. For the meaning of *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ* here, see footnote 12 above. It is important to distinguish between the *ʿāmil* causing *rafʿ* in these patterns: whereas the *ʿāmil* causing the noun after *ḥattā* to take the *rafʿ* case is the *ʿāmil* named *al-ibtidāʾ*, the *ʿāmil* which causes the verb after *ḥattā* to take the *rafʿ* mood is 'its occurrence (i.e. of the verb) in a position which a noun can occupy' (*kaynūnatuhu fī mawḍiʿi l-ismi*—see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 236, Derenbourg 1, 364/Hārūn 3, 10) and *not* the *ʿāmil* named *al-ibtidāʾ* (I thank Prof. Aryeh Levin for helping me understand this point).

One of the proofs that *ḥattā* in this sentence type is indeed a *ḥarf ibtidāʾ* is the fact that one can add to *ḥattā* an utterance beginning with the particle *ʾinna*, exactly as such an utterance can be added to *ʾiḏā*, which is one of the *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ*. In other words, the fact that one could say حتّى إنّه يفعل ذاك "so [much] that he does it", as one could say فإذا إنّه يفعل ذاك "here he does it", proves that in this case, *ḥattā* is one of the *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ*.[18] Other examples of this sentence type which Sībawayhi provides later in this chapter are: شربت حتّى يجيءُ البعير يجرّ بطنه "I drank [such a great quantity of water] that the camel would drag its stomach [on the ground, if it drank such a quantity]";[19] مرض حتّى يمرُّ به الطائر فيرحمُه "he was so sick that the bird passes by him and feels sorry for him";[20] سرت حتّى يعلمُ الله أنّي كالّ "I went [so much] that God knows that I am tired"; لقد ضُرِب أمس حتّى لا يستطيعُ أن يتحرّك اليوم "he was beaten yesterday [so much] that he cannot move today".[21]

For three of these four sentence types (b, c and d) Sībawayhi mentions the time that the verb following *ḥattā* conveys, whereas in one (a) this issue remains open: In b, in which *ḥattā* has the meaning of *kay*, the action of the verb after *ḥattā* has not yet occurred; in c, the two actions are sequential, and both must have taken place in the past; and in d, the two actions are not sequential, and the action of the verb after *ḥattā* occurs in the present. As for sentence type a, in which *ḥattā* occurs in the meaning of *ʾilā ʾan*, Sībawayhi himself does not say anything about the time of the verb following *ḥattā*.

Most grammarians adopt Sībawayhi's views and attempt to explain them further and elucidate his intentions. It seems to me that the complexity of Sībawayhi's explanations, as well as a desire to create a simple distinction between the two moods of the verb following *ḥattā*, caused the grammarians to propose their various theories on the matter.

---

[18] See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 238, Derenbourg 1, 368/Hārūn 3, 18–19. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīqa* 2, 138, who adds that had *ḥattā* here been one of the *ḥurūf al-jarr*, *ʾanna* would have been expected to be joined to it rather than *ʾinna*. To the distinction between *ḥattā ʾinna* and *ḥattā ʾanna* Sībawayhi devotes chapter 270 (see Derenbourg 1, 420–421/Hārūn 3, 143–145), where he explains that after *ḥattā*, which is one of the *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ*, *ʾinna* (and not *ʾanna*) should be used. The sequence *ḥattā ʾanna* is only possible, according to Sībawayhi, when it is 'the conjunctive *ḥattā*' (*ḥattā l-ʿāṭifa*). Cf. Fleischer, *Schriften* 1.2, 406.

[19] See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 238, Derenbourg 1, 367–368/Hārūn 3, 18.

[20] See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* Derenbourg 1, 368/Hārūn 3, 19.

[21] See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* Derenbourg 1, 368/Hārūn 3, 20.

Later grammarians, such as al-Zamaḫšarī (6th/12th century), offer the theory that *naṣb* is used when the verb after *ḥattā* indicates a future time, whereas *rafʿ* serves to indicate the present. al-Zamaḫšarī says that in either mood the time of the verb after *ḥattā* may be relative or absolute: in the case of *naṣb*, the future time may be relative to the time of the occurrence of the verb before *ḥattā* (relative future) or to the time of speech (absolute future). Similarly, in the case of *rafʿ*, the present time may be relative to the time of the occurrence of the verb before *ḥattā* (relative or historical present, which he calls *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiya*) or to the time of speech (absolute present).[22] Ibn Yaʿīš interprets al-Zamaḫšarī's words here and explains that the *ʿawāmil* causing the imperfect verb to take the *naṣb* cannot influence such a verb when it indicates the present time, only when it indicates the future time. Therefore, a *manṣūb* verb after *ḥattā* necessarily means that the time of this verb is future—be it absolute or relative. An example for an absolute future, continues Ibn Yaʿīš, is the sentence أطع اللّٰه حتّى يُدخلَك الجنّة "obey God so that he will let you into heaven!", in which both verbs indicate an action which has not yet occurred, and an example for a relative future is the sentence سرت حتّى أدخلَها, in which both verbs indicate an action which has already occurred in the past, but the second is in a future time relative to the first.[23] As for the possibility of a *marfūʿ* verb after *ḥattā*, Ibn Yaʿīš explains al-Zamaḫšarī's words regarding the present time that this verb indicates, be it relative or absolute.

al-Zamaḫšarī's theory as explained above, which is accepted by other later grammarians such as Ibn Mālik and Ibn ʿAqīl,[24] is an attempt to cope with examples where it is clear that, on the one hand, both verbs before *ḥattā* and following it indicate the past tense, and on the other hand, the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *naṣb* mood: Such an example is the sentence سرت أمس حتّى أدخلَها وخرجت منها اليوم "I went yesterday until its entering point and I exited it today".[25]

---

[22] See al-Zamaḫšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī ṣunʿat al-ʾiʿrāb*, ed. J.P. Broch, 2nd edition (Christiania, 1879), 110/al-Zamaḫšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī ʿilm al-luġa wabiḏaylihi kitāb al-mufaḍḍal fī šarḥ ʾabyāt al-mufaṣṣal li-Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn Abī Firās al-Naʿsānī l-Ḥalabī*, ed. M.ʿI.D. al-Saʿīdī, (Beirut, 1990), 295.

[23] See Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* (1886) 2, 937–938/Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* (2001) 3, 261–262.

[24] See, for example, Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya l-šāfiya*, ed ʿA. M. Muʿawwaḍ and ʿĀ. A. ʿAbd al-Mawjūd (Beirut, 1420/2000) 2, 106; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Alfijjah Carmen Didacticum Grammaticum auctore Ibn Mālik et in Alfijjam commentarius quem conscripsit Ibn ʿaqīl*, ed. F. Dieterici (Leipzig, 1851) 2, 295/Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ Ibn ʿAqīl ʿalā ʾalfiyyat Abī ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad Jamāl al-Dīn b. Mālik*, ed. M.M.D. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (Cairo, 1350/1931) 2, 245.

[25] See al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid fī šarḥ al-ʾīḍāḥ*, ed. K.B. al-Marjān (Baghdad, 1982) 2, 1083.

These grammarians claim that although the verb following *ḥattā* in such examples does not indicate an action which has not yet occurred (absolute future), its occurrence at a future time relative to the action before it, allows it to take the *naṣb* mood (relative future).

The main problem with the above distinction is that it cannot be a definitive criterion for distinguishing between the *naṣb* and the *rafʿ* moods, but can only serve as an explanation for some of the examples in which the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *naṣb* mood. The reason is that the verb following *ḥattā*, be it in *naṣb* or *rafʿ*, indicates an action that occurs *after* the action of the verb before *ḥattā*. One can compare, for example, the first and the third sentence types that Sībawayhi introduces (see above), and realize that in both of them the action of the verb after *ḥattā* occurs *after* the action of the verb before *ḥattā*, whereas in the first *naṣb* is used and in the other—*rafʿ*.

3. al-Astarābāḏī's Proposal of a Relationship between the Mood of the Verb Following *ḥattā* and the Speaker's Intention

The first grammarian who raises and treats the problem mentioned above is al-Astarābāḏī (7th/13th century), the most famous of the commentators on Ibn al-Ḥājib's *al-Kāfiya*. In his commentaries on Ibn al-Ḥājib's discussion on *ḥattā*, al-Astarābāḏī justifies and praises the latter, who with regard to the possibility of the *naṣb*, does not mention the absolute but only the relative future. According to al-Astarābāḏī, putting the verb following *ḥattā* in the *naṣb* does not necessarily mean that the action which this verb indicates occurs in a future time relative to the time of speech (i.e. absolute future). The *naṣb* is possible, he states, when this action is in a future time relative to the occurrence of the first action, indicated by the verb preceding *ḥattā*, because during the occurrence of the first action, the *naṣb* of the second verb indicates that the action of this verb is expected to take place, whether, with regard to the time of speech, it has indeed occurred (in the past), is occurring (in the present), will occur after the time of speech (in the future) or shall not occur at all due to a certain action which has prevented its occurrence in reality.[26] al-Astarābāḏī goes on to say that the time of the verb following *ḥattā* cannot be the sole definitive criterion for distinguishing between the *naṣb* and the *rafʿ*

[26] See al-Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥājib*, ed. I.B. Yaʿqūb (Beirut, 1419/1998) 4, 57–58.

moods, because, as explained above, in both cases the action of the verb following *ḥattā* occurs *after* the action of the verb preceding it. Therefore, it is indeed correct to claim that the *manṣūb* verb following *ḥattā* reflects an occurrence in a future time relative to the occurrence of the first action, but this claim is by no means a definitive criterion for distinguishing between the two moods. This claim should be regarded solely as an answer to the following question: how is it possible that in the sentence سرت حتّى أدخلَها, in which the action of the verb أدخلَها can take place in the past, present or future, the verb can take the *naṣb* mood due to the influence of *ʾan al-muḍmara*,[27] which is *ʿalam al-istiqbāl*? The answer to this question, according to al-Astarābāḏī, is that the *naṣb* of the verb following *ḥattā*, which is caused by *ʾan* (i.e. *ʾan al-muḍmara*), is possible since the action of this verb is in a future time relative to the occurrence of the first action, expressed by the verb preceding *ḥattā*.[28]

After showing that the time of the verb cannot be a definitive criterion for distinguishing between the *naṣb* and the *rafʿ* moods, al-Astarābāḏī arrives at the important question: how can one distinguish between the two moods and decide when to put the verb following *ḥattā* in *naṣb* and when to put it in *rafʿ*? His answer to this question is that the distinction between the two moods is strongly connected to the speaker's intention and to the question of what he wishes to express—in al-Astarābāḏī's words: ذاك إلى قصد المتكلّم "that (i.e. deciding if the verb takes *naṣb* or *rafʿ*) depends on the speaker's intention". al-Astarābāḏī explains that the *naṣb* mood can indicate two kinds of actions:

– one which has not yet occurred (that is, absolute future)
– one of which the speaker wants to say that it is meant to occur, without implying whether it has indeed occurred or not. This action, elaborates al-Astarābāḏī, may convey an occurrence in any of the three times (past, present or future), but it can also be that this action does not occur at all, due to another action which has prevented its occurrence in reality.

The *rafʿ* mood, on the contrary, according to al-Astarābāḏī, indicates that the action has occurred in the past or is occurring in the present and the

27 *ʾAn* concealed in the mind of the speaker. For this term, see footnote 6 above.
28 See al-Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* 4, 58.

intention of the speaker is to indicate that it has indeed occurred or is currently occurring.[29]

It is interesting to note that some modern researchers seem to express the same idea that al-Astarābāḏī conveys in his theory concerning the strong connection between the speaker's intention and the decision regarding the mood of the verb following *ḥattā*. None of them, however, seems to rely on al-Astarābāḏī's whole theory as described above.[30] Following is a summary of their words on this issue:

a. Vernier briefly expresses an opinion similar to that of al-Astarābāḏī.[31]
b. Reckendorf points to the two kinds of actions that, according to al-Astarābāḏī, the *naṣb* mood can indicate.[32] He adds that even when the verb after *ḥattā* indicates an action which has occurred in the past, it is possible to find it in *rafʿ*, as an indicator of an "historical present", or in *naṣb*, as an action about which the speaker wishes to convey that it is expected to occur.[33] According to Reckendorf, after a main clause in

[29] See al-Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* 4, 58 and 59. Ibn Hišām, al-Ušmūnī and al-Suyūṭī explicitly say that the verb after *ḥattā* must be put in *naṣb* when it indicates a future time relative to the time of speech (that is, absolute future), whereas when it indicates a relative future, it can be put in either *naṣb* or *rafʿ*, depending on the speaker's intention. See Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī l-labīb ʿan kutub al-ʾaʿārīb* (Cairo, 1328/1910) 1, 104; Ibn Hišām, *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaġīr fī l-naḥw*, ed. A.M. al-Hirmīl (Cairo, 1400/1980) 173; al-Ušmūnī, *Šarḥ al-Ušmūnī ʿalā ʾalfiyyat Ibn Mālik*, ed. Ḥ. Ḥamd and I.B. Yaʿqūb (Beirut, 1419/1998) 3, 205; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ al-hawāmiʿ fī šarḥ jamʿ al-jawāmiʿ*, ed. ʿA.ʿĀ.S. Mukrim (Beirut, 1413/1992) 4, 111. From what Ibn Mālik and his son say it is also inferred that the intention of the speaker is an important factor in the decision as to which mood the verb after *ḥattā* takes. In reference to sentences in which the verb after *ḥattā* indicates the past, both of them explain that either *naṣb* or *rafʿ* are possible and the decision between them is taken according to the speaker's intention. See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* 2, 121; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ Ibn al-Nāẓim ʿalā ʾalfiyyat Ibn Mālik*, ed. M.B.ʿU. al-Sūd (Beirut, 2000), 481.

[30] One exception is al-Sāmarrāʾī, who does cite al-Astarābāḏī, but incompletely: he cites only the first part of al-Astarābāḏī's words concerning the *naṣb* after *ḥattā* (that is, concerning the absolute future), but ignores the second part concerning the speaker's intention to convey that the action is meant to occur, without implying whether it has indeed occurred or not. As a result, al-Sāmarrāʾī arrives at the false conclusion that the *naṣb* must mean, according to al-Astarābāḏī, that the action of the verb will occur in a future time relative to the time of speech. See F.Ṣ. al-Sāmarrāʾī, *Maʿānī l-naḥw* (Amman, 1420/2000), 3, 376.

[31] See D.S.J. Vernier, *Grammaire arabe composée d'après les sources primitive*s (Beirut, 1891–1892), 2, 498 (§1044).

[32] See H. Reckendorf, *Die Syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen* (Leiden, 1898), 735 (part of §241) and H. Reckendorf, *Arabische Syntax* (Heidelberg, 1921), 457 (beginning of §226).

[33] See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 735 and 736.

which the verb indicates the past, the *naṣb* mood may indicate an action which, relative to the time of speech, has already occurred or not.[34]

c. Ḥasan also notes the important distinction which al-Astarābāḏī makes between the *rafʿ* and the *naṣb* moods. According to Ḥasan, *rafʿ* in the verb following *ḥattā* indicates that the action did occur in reality, whereas *naṣb* merely conveys that this action is expected to occur. Ḥasan goes on to say that *rafʿ* indicates that both actions, i.e. of the verbs before and after *ḥattā*, indeed occurred in reality, whereas *naṣb* indicates that the action of the verb before *ḥattā* indeed occurred and that the action of the verb after *ḥattā* is expected to occur in the future, without the speaker implying whether or not it is about to occur, even if this occurrence is a known fact.[35]

I find al-Astarābāḏī's explanation convincing, since it fits both Sībawayhi's theory of the four sentence types used after *ḥattā* and the examples from the living language. In addition, it also corresponds to similar characteristics of other particles, after which the verb may appear in *naṣb* and in *rafʿ*, such as the particle *fa-* (meaning "and then, as a result"): the *naṣb* mood represents an uncertainty of the speaker as to the occurrence of the verb, whereas the *rafʿ* mood, on the contrary, represents the speaker's certainty as to the occurrence of this verb.[36]

Conclusion

In this paper I examined one important aspect related to the usage of an imperfect verb after *ḥattā*: the relationship between the time that such a verb conveys and its mood. Following a short section on the intensive preoccupation of medieval Arab grammarians with *ḥattā* (§1), the views of Sībawayhi, al-Zamaḫšarī (representing other later grammarians, too) and al-Astarābāḏī were introduced, mainly with respect to the question of the time which the verb following *ḥattā* conveys (§§2–3). Sībawayhi posits four different sentence types with an imperfect verb following *ḥattā*, the first of which is the only one for which he does not mention the time that the verb following *ḥattā* conveys (his example for this type is سرت حتّى

[34] See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 736.
[35] See ʿA. Ḥasan, *al-Naḥw al-wāfī* (Cairo, 1987), 4, 344, footnote 1 and 348–349.
[36] On this point, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* chapter 241, Derenbourg 1, 376/Hārūn 3, 36.

أدخلَها "I went until the point of entering it").[37] In view of al-Astarābāḏī's words, explained in §3, I believe that the verb following *ḥattā* in this sentence type may convey either an action which has not yet occurred (absolute future) or an action of which the speaker wants to say that it is meant to occur, without implying whether it has indeed occurred or not. This solution seems more probable than that proposed by al-Zamaḫšarī (and other later grammarians), detailed in §2. In addition, it fits other environments of the *naṣb* mood (see the end of §3).

References

Primary Sources

al-Astarābāḏī, Raḍī l-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan. *Šarḥ kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥājib*. Edited by Imīl Badīʿ Yaʿqūb, 5 vols. Beirut, 1419/1998.
al-Bustānī, Buṭrus b. Būlus. *Muḥīṭ al-muḥīṭ: Qāmūs muṭawwal lil-luġa l-ʿarabiyya*. 2 vols. Beirut, 1870.
al-Fārisī, Abū ʿAlī l-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Ġaffār. *al-Taʿlīqa ʿalā kitāb Sībawayhi*. Edited by ʿAwaḍ b. Ḥamad al-Qūzī. 6 vols. Cairo, 1990–1996.
al-Fīrūzābādī, Majd al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb. *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ*. Beirut, 1407/1987.
Ibn ʿAqīl, Bahāʾ al-Dīn ʿAbdallāh. *Alfijjah Carmen Didacticum Grammaticum auctore Ibn Mālik et in Alfijjam commentarius quem conscripsit Ibn ʿaqīl*. Edited by F. Dieterici. Leipzig, 1851.
——, *Šarḥ Ibn ʿAqīl ʿalā ʾalfiyyat Abī ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad Jamāl al-Dīn b. Mālik*. Edited by Muḥammad Mahdī l-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. 2 vols. Cairo, 1350/1931.
Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn ʿAbdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. ʿAbdallāh. *Muġnī l-labīb ʿan kutub al-ʾaʿārīb*. 2 vols. Cairo, 1328/1910.
——, *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaġīr fī l-naḥw*. Edited by Aḥmad Maḥmūd al-Hirmīl. Cairo, 1400/1980.
Ibn Mālik, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbdallāh. *Šarḥ al-kāfiya l-šāfiya*. Edited by ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwaḍ and ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd. 2 vols. Beirut, 1420/2000.
Ibn al-Nāẓim, Abū ʿAbdallāh Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad, *Šarḥ Ibn al-Nāẓim ʿalā ʾalfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Edited by Muḥammad Bāsil ʿUyūn al-Sūd. Beirut, 1420/2000.
Ibn Yaʿīš, Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū l-Baqāʾ. *Ibn Jaʿîś Commentar zu Zamachśarī's Mufaṣṣal*. Edited by G. Jahn. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1882–1886.
——, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal*. Edited by Aḥmad al-Sayyid Aḥmad and Ismāʿīl ʿAbd al-Jawwād ʿAbd al-Ġanī. 4 vols. Cairo, 2001.
al-Jurjānī, ʿAbd al-Qāhir. *al-Muqtaṣid fī šarḥ al-ʾīḍāḥ*. Edited by Kāẓim Baḥr al-Marjān. 2 vols. Baghdad, 1982.
al-Kaffawī, Abū l-Baqāʾ Ayyūb b. Mūsā l-Ḥusaynī. *al-Kulliyyāt: Muʿjam fī l-muṣṭalaḥāt wal-furūq al-luġawiyya*. Beirut, 1992.
al-Šantamarī, Abū l-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf b. Sulaymān b. ʿĪsā. *al-Nukat fī tafsīr kitāb Sībawayhi*. Edited by Zuhayr ʿAbd al-Muḥsin Sulṭān. 2 vols. Kuwait, 1407/1987.
Sībawayhi, ʿAmr ibn ʿUṯmān. *Kitāb*, (1) *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Edited by H. Derenbourg. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–9 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag 1970), (2) edited by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. 5 vols. Cairo, 1988.

[37] For the reference, see footnote 5.

al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn. *Hamʿ al-hawāmiʿ fī šarḥ jamʿ al-jawāmiʿ*. Edited by ʿAbd al-ʿĀl Sālim Mukrim. 6 vols. Beirut, 1413/1992.
al-Ušmūnī, Abū l-Ḥasan Nūr al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā. *Šarḥ al-Ušmūnī ʿalā ʾalfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Edited by Ḥasan Ḥamd and Imīl Badīʿ Yaʿqūb. 4 vols. Beirut, 1419/1998.
al-Zamaḫšarī, Abū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar. *al-Mufaṣṣal fī ṣunʿat al-ʾiʿrāb*. Edited by J.P. Broch, 2nd edition, Christiania, 1879.
——, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī ʿilm al-luġa wabiḏaylihi kitāb al-mufaḍḍal fī šarḥ ʾabyāt al-mufaṣṣal li-Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn Abī Firās al-Naʿsānī l-Ḥalabī*. Edited by Muḥammad ʿIzz al-Dīn al-Saʿīdī. Beirut, 1410/1990.
al-Zabīdī, Murtaḍā b. Muḥammad. *Šarḥ al-qāmūs al-musammā tāj al-ʿarūs min jawāhir al-qāmūs*. 20 vols. Beirut, 1414/1994.

Secondary Sources

Fleischer, H.L. *Kleinere Schriften*. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1885–1888. [reprint of *Beiträge zur arabischen Sprachkunde: Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kgl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*. Leipzig, 1863–1884].
Ḥasan, ʿA. *al-Naḥw al-wāfī*. 4 vols. Cairo, 1987.
Jahn, G. *Sībawaihi's Buch über die Grammatik, übersetzt und erklärt von Dr. G. Jahn*. 2 vols. (every volume contains two parts). Berlin, 1895.
Lane, E.W. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. 8 vols. London, 1863–1893.
Mosel, U. *Die syntaktische Terminologie bei Sībawaih*. 2 vols. Munich, 1975.
Reckendorf, H. *Arabische Syntax*. Heidelberg, 1921.
——, *Die Syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen*. Leiden, 1898.
al-Sāmarrāʾī, F. Ṣ. *Maʿānī l-naḥw*. 4 vols. Amman, 1420/2000.
Talmon, R. "*Ḥattā* + Imperfect and chapter 239 in Sībawayhi's Kitāb: A study in the early history of Arabic Grammar." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 38 (1993): 71–95.
Trumpp, E. *Einleitung in das Studium der arabischen Grammatiker: die Ajrumiyyah* [*sic*] *des Muhammad bin Daūd: arabischer text mit Uebersetzung und Erläuterungen von Ernst Trumpp*. Munich, 1876.
Vernier, D.S.J. *Grammaire arabe composée d'après les sources primitive*s. 2 vols. Beirut, 1891–1892.

PART III

THE GRAMMAR OF OTHERS

ELEMENTS OF THE SYRIAC GRAMMATICAL TRADITION AS THESE RELATE TO THE ORIGINS OF ARABIC GRAMMAR

Daniel King

Introduction

The proposition that Arabic grammar had its sources in the Greek grammatical and/or philosophical traditions is well-worn territory that retains still the shadow of political and religious concerns. Any potential Syriac sources for Arabic grammar were ruled out by Merx and, with some exceptions, have hardly had a hearing since.[1] I shall not seek to overturn the *status quo* in either field. I do believe, however, that the debate about origins has generally taken too little notice of generic social and cultural issues surrounding the 'academia' of the era of Sībawayhi and his associates in the second half of the second century AH. It is manifestly not my purpose to propose new suggestions as to the origins of Sībawayhi's theories—such is a matter for a much closer analysis of the text itself and must ultimately be decided on internal grounds. An understanding of those origins, however, requires not merely an appreciation of textual descent and debt but of the cultural environment in which textual phenomena arise. To this end, the current paper will be limited to an overview of the Syriac grammatical tradition, elaborating upon some of its salient trends and characteristics and describing as far as the evidence may allow the social and cultural contexts in which it was pursued, before rounding off with some consideration of the question of how this relates to and illuminates the question of the origins of the science of Arabic grammar. A very brief summary of the extant texts of the Syriac grammatical tradition is appended, a fuller version of which may be found elsewhere.[2] Naturally each and every text that is here mentioned in passing is worthy of more profound analysis and in many cases this scholarly task has hardly proceeded beyond the preliminaries.

[1] A. Merx, *Historia artis grammaticae apud Syros* (Leipzig, 1889), ch. IX.

[2] Viz. the introduction to the new English translation of Merx, forthcoming with Gorgias Press, Piscataway, NJ.

1. The Earliest Evidence

The Syrians' reflection upon their own language *qua* language almost certainly goes back beyond the veil that conceals the far side of our earliest extant evidence. The oldest dated Syriac manuscript (AD411) already contains a variety of markings, some designed to indicate which of two or more homographs should be understood, others to divide sentences and clauses. Thus before any grammatical texts as such came into being, scribes were already anticipating the major issues that would come to dominate the considerations of the grammarians themselves. It hardly needs pointing out that both the abovementioned types of marking have really one and the same purpose, namely to assist the reader (reading most likely to an audience) in converting a stream of consonants into meaningful speech; in others words, these points aim to mimic the forms of speech that are otherwise unrepresented on parchment, including both vowels and other intonations of the voice. Such a procedure presupposes abstract reflection upon what constitutes the logical divisions of speech, i.e. a proto-linguistics not yet systematised into a linguistics proper. The complexity of the system grew rapidly in different directions resulting in a variety of systems that can only sometimes and with difficulty be reconstructed.[3]

It must always therefore be kept in mind that the Syriac pointing systems (accentuation) and the grammatical reflections that grew therefrom were always grounded in the exercise of 'reading' texts, pre-eminently Biblical texts.[4] 'Reading' of this sort (starting with the Psalter) was, unsurprisingly, the central element in the school system of the Syriac churches from at least the fifth century,[5] and was in the special care of the *maqreyyana*

[3] Merx aimed to describe as many systems as possible on the basis of lists found in manuscripts, but admitted that very often these were mixed up and could not be disentangled. J.B. Segal, *The Diacritical Point and the Accents in Syriac* (London, 1953), took a different approach and tried to understand the development of the systems from Biblical manuscripts alone without recourse to the grammarians' theorizing about them; for a new interpretation of the pointing in the manuscript of 411, see F.S. Jones, "Early Syriac Pointing in and behind British Museum Additional Manuscript 12,150," in *Symposium Syriacum VII*, ed. R. Lavenant (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1998).

[4] Hebrew accentuation was also begun as an attempt to illustrate on the written page the hand movement of a 'conductor'—E.J. Revell, "Hebrew Accents and Greek Ekphonetic Neumes," in *Studies in Eastern Chant IV*, ed. M. Velimirovic (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979).

[5] A.H. Becker, *The Fear of God and the Beginning of Wisdom : the School of Nisibis and the development of scholastic culture in late antique Mesopotamia* (Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press, 2006), is the best recent overview of the Syriac school system, although

(lit. 'reader'), a fully paid-up position at the school of Nisibis (doubtless also at similar institutions elsewhere). One such was the first author of a Syriac grammar of any sort, Joseph Huzāyā, who appears to have translated for 'school' use, sometime in the middle of the sixth century, the best known Greek handbook to grammatical studies, namely Dionysius Thrax's *Technē Grammatikē*.[6] Later manuscripts and other references, however, usually cite Joseph as its real author and are unaware of its Greek origin, and indeed this attitude makes good sense when we appreciate that Joseph adapted and moulded his material to a new purpose (the description of Syriac), albeit in a rather unusual way.

To illustrate: much of the time, when some aspect of Greek grammar appears to be of no use for describing Syriac, the translator of the *Technē* discards it. Thus the whole section on phonology is simply omitted.[7] Smaller changes include the reduction of three verbal numbers to two,[8] and the explicit rejection of the category of verbal conjugations.[9] These contrasts are explicit (we frequently see the formula, 'the Greeks do this … but the Syrians do this'). Elsewhere, however, the translator will try to force his language into the mould of its model. For instance, Dionysius says that in Greek there are two forms of superlative adjective, those in –τατος and those in –τος; Joseph also needs to have two types, and since one can construct a superlative in Syriac either from a construct phrase or from an analytical expression with 'd', so he can offer us two types as well![10] Dionysius' complex description of noun 'shapes' is imitated in similar manner.[11] To mimic Dionysius' explanation of compound verbal forms the Syriac forms prefixed with *-eth* are offered as if analogous.[12] To Joseph it must have appeared so. After all, he prefixes his

---

focusing mostly on the Church of the East. A general survey of the West Syrian system is wanting, largely since it could only be done on the basis of texts supposedly produced for it—there being no general history of the West Syrian schools already in antiquity.

6 G. Uhlig, ed., *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica* (Leipzig, 1883); the Syriac was edited in Merx, *Historia*, as Appendix III, with a translation in chapter 2. Merx doubts the attribution to Huzāyā who is mentioned only in later mss, but R. Contini, "Considerazioni interlinguistiche sull'adattamento siriaco della 'Techne Grammatike' di Dionisio Trace," in *La diffusione dell'eredità classica nell'età tardoantica e medievale. Il Romanzo di Alessandro e altri scritti*, ed. B.M. Finazzi and A. Valvo (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1998), 99–100, finds no cause to suspect it.

7 The Syriac starts at 22,4 Uhlig.

8 30,5 Uhlig; Syriac at Merx, ܢܒ (trans., 13).

9 47,1–2 Uhlig; Merx, ܢܛ (17)

10 28,4–5 Uhlig; Merx, ܢܐ (11).

11 29,5–30,4 Uhlig; Merx, ܢܒ (12).

12 50,3–51,1 Uhlig; Merx, ܣ (17).

whole 'translation' with the words, "The wise men of the Greeks say...," revealing thereby a presupposed fundamentalism in which descriptions of language are descriptions of reality, comparable to Aristotelian logic, a presupposition which, as we shall see, pervades the Syriac tradition (of logic as well as of grammar).

2. The Masoretic Traditions

Now Joseph's sometimes forced adaptation of the *Technē Grammatikē* did not exist in a cultural vacuum. As a teacher of 'reading' at the School of Nisibis, Joseph was concerned above all with the preservation of the traditions, as he and his colleagues saw it, of public scriptural reading and exegesis, and hence as guardians of church and people. This is the purpose that binds together all that we know about this particular reader. Barhebraeus attributes to Joseph the School's decision to adopt a change in the official 'reading system',[13] and we should associate with this information another report to the effect that Joseph was held responsible by later generations for the elaboration of the Syriac system of accents, the beginnings of which we mentioned above in connection with the manuscript of 411.[14] The manuscript containing this latter report is the most important exemplar of what has (a little unfortunately) been called the East Syrian masorah, a substantial number of sometimes extended Biblical passages copiously provided with points to indicate accentuation and other marks for live speech delivery.[15] This constituted what the Syrians called the *mašlmanuta* (tradition), handed down by the readers (*maqreyyane*) in the schools, not in an uncontested fashion, for disagreements between authorities are part and parcel of this process, yet in such a way as to leave us in no doubt that here lies the cultural and also the theological context and justification for the study of grammar as such. Dionysius Thrax had instilled the notion that grammar was about 'recognition' (*anagnōsis*),

---

13 J.B. Abbeloos and T.J. Lamy, eds., *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* (London and Paris, 1877), vol.3, p.78: *he altered the reading method of Edessa to the eastern one which the Nestorians use even though throughout the time of Narsai they read like us westerners*. This is surely what Barhebraeus means by *qeryata*, not that Joseph actually changed the dialect itself!

14 BL Add. 12,138, f.312a, quoted in Segal, *Diacritical Point*, 66, with a textual reconstruction which may be deemed unnecessary.

15 Named on the analogy of the Hebrew masorah, the Syriac really has a different character and need not live in the shadow of its better known namesake. See the new study of Jonathan Loopstra, *Patristic Selections in the 'Masoretic' Handbooks of the Qarqaptā Tradition* (Leuven: Peeters, Forthcoming).

by which he means the recognition of the basic grammatical forms of a written text as well as higher discourse levels such as metaphor etc., i.e. 'reading' in its fullest sense. From analysis of the constituent letters of the language to lists of difficult or foreign words, to basic exegetical scholia, all these were the meat and drink of the *mašlmanuta*.

Whereas the abovementioned manuscript is the only extant exemplar of the East Syrian *mašlmanuta*, that of the West Syrian church is rather better attested through a number of (sometimes early) manuscripts.[16] Many of the readings and comments on phonology and orthography contained within these codices are attributed to the 'Karkaphensian version' and it was the insight of the Abbé Martin over a century ago to show that this referred not to a particular recension of the Bible but to the teaching tradition of one particular monastic school over a long period of time.[17] It is in the context of such manuscripts that the earliest texts of the Syriac grammatical tradition (up to c. 800) are preserved. Even after this date when grammars were written for their own sakes (mostly by East Syrians, e.g. Elias of Ṭirhan, Elias bar Šinaya, Joseph bar Malkon) and not as appendices to the masorah, the material used to illustrate grammatical points was always drawn from the masorah, both that relating to the Bible and the so-called 'patristic masorah' of the Fathers of the Church.

To stay with the earlier period, however, one may readily gauge from any list of Syriac grammatical texts that these early quasi-grammatical texts ranged from simple lists of difficult words found in the scriptures, loanwords and homographs,[18] to more complex accounts of morphology. Many of them reflect different stages in what was evidently a developing process. Thomas the Deacon's list of accents and explanations of them, authored early in the seventh century, is a self-conscious elaboration of the system attributed to Joseph Huzāyā, and at least some of the anonymous treatises on accents are in turn indebted to Thomas as their predecessor. The works of Jacob of Edessa too are essentially a

---

[16] BL Add 7,183; Add. 12,178; Vat. Borg. K.VIII.6; Vat. Syr. 152; Paris Syr. 142.

[17] J.P.P. Martin, «Histoire de la ponctuation, ou de la massore chez les Syriens,» *Journal Asiatique* 7,5 (1875), and "Tradition karkaphienne, ou la massore chez les Syriens," *Journal Asiatique* 6,14 (1869). But see now Coakley in *JSS* 56,318ff.

[18] The study of homographs formed the starting point of the discipline of Syriac lexicography. ʿEnanišoʿ (see below) seems to have been the first to compile a significant lexicon of this kind; and Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq's revision of it (possibly under influence from the *Kitāb al-ʿayn*) constitutes the first real Syriac lexicon, a tradition brought to fruition in the voluminous works of Bar ʿAlī and Bar Bahlūl. C. Balzaretti, "Ancient Treatises on Syriac Homonyms," *Oriens Christianus* 89 (1997), provides an overview of the genre especially as it appears in Barhebraeus.

development of the *mašlmanuta*, of which he was always seen as the most celebrated proponent; hence his works are generally preserved in the context of other 'masoretic' material, to which Jacob was also indebted.

Interestingly, it was within this process of development that the Syrians became concerned with the origins of their own grammatical tradition. One of the small treatises found in this collection attributed the invention of the very notion of accents to Epiphanius, the Greek heretic-hunter, and expressly links this with Aristotle's division of all speech into five types of discourse.[19] Thus we can see the same underlying conception as in the translation of the *Technē*, namely that grammatical systems were invented by the Greeks and are equally applicable to all languages. It is crucial to recognise that Syriac grammar did not really conceive of itself as a grammar of the Syriac language so much as a universal grammar adapted for specific use among Syriac-speaking students. Hence there need be only one 'inventor' of accents as such, whichever language this might have occurred in.[20]

This universalising trend within Syriac grammatical studies explains a very odd feature of the tradition, namely the extensive overlap, even confusion, that persisted between grammar and logic. A debate between the relative merits of the two disciplines such as we witness in ʿAbbāsid Baghdad is inconceivable in late antique Syria. Even among the more developed logicians of the seventh century we can see an identification being made between the subject matter of the *Technē* and that of Aristotle's *De Interpretatione*,[21] an identification that is expressly rejected in the Arabic literature.[22]

---

[19] Epiphanius was chosen for this dubious honour most likely because he had already been given authorship of a list of Greek accents included in the masoretic material, in turn on the basis of his (genuine) discussion of the (Greek) alphabet and Origen's text critical symbols in his *On Weights and Measures*, another text well known in Syriac masoretic circles. Jonathan Loopstra, "A Syriac Tract for the 'Explanation' of Hebrew and Foreign Words," in *The Old Testament as Authoritative Scripture in the Early Churches of the East*, ed. V.S. Hovhanessian (New York: Peter Lang, 2010).

[20] There was consistent and changing tension among Syrians as to the relative prestige of Syriac (a language uncorrupted by the pagans) and Greek (the language of education and knowledge). See Sebastian P. Brock, "From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac attitudes to Greek learning," in *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, ed. N. Garsoïan, T. Matthews, and R. Thomson (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1982).

[21] E.g. Athanasius of Balad's *Introduction to Logic* works its way systematically through the *Organon* and yet in place of any summary or description of the *De Int.*, we have instead a summary of the *Technē*.

[22] A. Elamrani-Jamal, *Logique aristotélicienne et Grammaire arabe* (Paris: Vrin, 1983), 146, who points to the obvious parallel in Port Royal grammar, although in the Syriac case the identity was rather assumed than demonstrated.

It was on the back of this that theorists such as Thomas the Deacon, Jacob of Edessa, John Bar Zuʿbi, and others elaborated the accent system on the basis of the Aristotelian types of discourse,[23] working to the presupposition that the Greek philosophical divisions (concocting such divisions was the everyday work of pedagogical philosophy in all the late antique schools) represented an underlying reality which the accentual system must represent as completely as possible. In practice, this meant reinterpreting the meanings of certain signs, assigning what are essentially the same sign to different categories, and inventing new signs simply in order to fit the preconceived schema. Bar Zuʿbi did this with the Stoic system as well as the Peripatetic.[24]

3. Jacob of Edessa

Included among these masoretic para-texts are two that belong to the most renowned of early Syriac grammarians, Jacob of Edessa (d.708).[25] His letter on orthography and a treatise on persons and genders both treat just those kinds of topics with which the *mašlmanuta* was concerned and hence their preservation here is hardly fortuitous.[26] Jacob also wrote a full grammar (entitled *twrṣ mmllʾ*, *The Correction of Speech*), the first such to be written in Syriac (if we exclude Huzāyā's translation) and, although extant only in small fragments even the order of which is uncertain, we can discern in Jacob a first rate mind and a true linguist. The grammar itself has been carefully and fully described elsewhere and this need not be repeated here,[27] save to note that some specific suggestions have been

[23] E.J. Revell, "Aristotle and the Accents: The Categories of Speech in Jewish and other authors," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 19, no. 1 (1974).

[24] For details, D. King, "Grammar and Logic in Syriac (and Arabic)," (Forthcoming).

[25] Jacob has fortunately been the subject of renewed study recently, the result being two collected volumes on his very diverse œuvre, B. Ter Haar Romeny, ed., *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of his Day* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), and G.Y. Ibrahim and G. Kiraz, eds., *Studies on Jacob of Edessa* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2010).

[26] *On Persons and Genders* is edited and translated in G. Phillips, ed., *A Letter by Mar Jacob, Bishop of Edessa, on Syriac orthography* (London, 1869), though the terms 'person' and 'gender' are not really what Jacob means by *prṣope* and *gense*. The first means the graphematic expressions of an inflected form (lit., 'faces', his first example being three vocalisations of the letters *ʾwdʾ*) while the second (lit., 'genera, kinds') refers to the difference between the first person singular perfect of the verb and the third person feminine, which in Syriac are homographic. Hence Jacob's real interest in (masoretic) orthography and reading rather than morphology as such is readily recognised.

[27] E.J. Revell, "The Grammar of Jacob of Edessa and the Other Near Eastern Grammatical Traditions," *Parole de L'Orient* 3 (1972), 365–74, and R. Talmon, "Jacob of Edessa the Grammarian," in *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day*, ed. B. Ter Haar Romeny

made regarding influences from Jacob on the Arabic grammatical terminology of the pre-Sībawayhi era.[28]

It is rather more important to take note of the location of Jacob's grammatical studies, both geographically and culturally. Jacob himself travelled to different parts of northern Mesopotamia and Syria in his efforts to improve spiritual and educational standards and especially to teach Greek in monastic schools. There is no doubt at all that these monastic schools, located all over the landscape of the Syriac-speaking communities, were the locus for both logical and grammatical studies and that these were carried on (as we have seen) with a view to the public reading of scripture, to its exegesis, and to spiritual edification generally.[29] Jacob was admitted master of all these.

His was also still the multi-lingual world of the 'Umayyad administration. Most educated Syrians read Greek as comfortably as their own language and, although few people wrote in that language any longer outside the Byzantine empire, individuals were still commissioning grammars of Greek in Edessa even in the next century.[30] Jacob himself was familiar with elements of the work of grammarians in Constantinople. Many of his 'canons' presuppose their Greek exemplars; the second century Homeric scholar Nicanor may well have been a specific influence;[31] and he makes use of Thodosius' *Canons* (late fourth or early fifth cent.) and of Hesychius' lexicon (fifth or sixth) in his philosophical work.[32] His translation of the *Categories* presupposes an acquaintance with the Greek text or at least

(Leiden: Brill, 2008), 159–87. Merx, *Historia*, ch.5, offers a full analysis, although based on a different reconstruction of the fragments from that upon which Revell and Talmon work.

28 Talmon, "Jacob of Edessa the Grammarian," 174–6. While the first and third of Talmon's offerings seem rather far-fetched, the second and the fourth are worthy of closer consideration. The borrowing he suggests from logic (p.176) is not at all surprising within the Syriac tradition.

29 On the Hellenistic *Encyclios Paideia* as it was practised in the Syriac schools of the period, see J.W. Watt, "Grammar, Rhetoric, and the Enkyklios Paideia in Syriac," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 143 (1993), reprinted in *Rhetoric and Philosophy from Greek into Syriac* (Ashgate, 2010), ch.I.

30 That written in 810 at the request of an Edessene citizen by Michael, a future Syncellus of the Byzantine church. D. Donnet, *Le traité de la construction de la phrase de Michael Syncelle de Jérusalem* (Brussels, 1982).

31 Merx, *Historia*, 81–2, 86–8, perhaps on the basis of a suggestion in J.G.E. Hoffmann, ed., *Opuscula Nestoriana* (Kiel, 1880), xi.

32 H. Hugonnard-Roche, «Le Vocabulaire philosophique de l'être en syriaque, d'après des textes de Sergius de Res'aina et Jacques d'Édesse,» in *Arabic Theology, Arabic Philosophy. From the Many to the One: Essays in Celebration of Richard M. Frank*, ed. J.E. Montgomery (Leuven: Peeters, 2006).

with a teacher who had one,[33] and indeed the whole philosophical project conceived at the monastery of Qennešrē (where Jacob was trained) was designed for bilinguals who could read Aristotelian texts not yet translated.

4. Other Grammarians of the Age of Jacob

Although pre-eminent, Jacob was not the only active Syriac grammarian of the eighth century. Another was John the Stylite, who may have been a correspondent of Jacob of Edessa (the question of identity is uncertain).[34] John's grammar is largely derivative from Dionysius Thrax, although he does draw on some other sources unknown to us.[35] He also incorporated some of the linguistic teaching of Jacob of Edessa and thus takes his place at the beginning of the process of the reception of Jacob's grammar. John's work seems to have been used in turn by grammarians of a later age. Its purpose was no longer simply to mimic the Greek patterns of the older grammars but to ground students in a basic understanding of the structures of language, probably as the first stage toward an introduction to the art of logic.[36]

Dawidh bar Paulos belongs most likely to the same period.[37] An engaging West Syrian (Jacobite) theologian (possibly a bishop), Dawidh was a writer thoroughly involved in church life who also wrote an introductory

---

[33] E.g. D. King, *The Earliest Syriac Translation of Aristotle's Categories* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 221; 237, and more generic discussion in id., "The Genesis and Development of a Logical Lexicon in the Syriac Tradition," in *Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle*, ed. John W. Watt and J. Lossl (Ashgate: 2011). On Jacob as philosopher, H. Hugonnard-Roche, *La Logique d'Aristote du grec au syriaque : Études sur la Transmission des Textes de l'Organon et leur Interpretation philosophique* (Paris: Vrin, 2004), 39–55.

[34] R. Schröter, "Erster Brief Jackob's von Edessa an Johannes den Styliten," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 24 (1875), upheld the identity against Merx, who placed John the grammarian *before* Jacob of Edessa. A. Moberg, «Die syrische grammatik des Johannes Estonaja,» *Le monde oriental* 3 (1909), argued for Assemani's older ninth century dating. A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922), 258–9, sides with Schröter but seems not to notice the connection with the John the Stylite of a Paris ms. (Moberg, art.cit., 31; Baumstark, 342), who belongs to the same monastery as the grammarian and yet cannot be the same as Jacob's correspondent.

[35] Moberg, "Die syrische grammatik des Johannes Estonaja," provides the only description we have of this grammar. There is no edition of the text, which still lies concealed in an Iraqi monastery.

[36] Ibid.: 30.

[37] Baumstark, *Geschichte*, 272–3. Depending on the reading of certain evidence, Dawidh may belong to the early ninth century. He appears to quote Ḥunayn, but this may be a later gloss.

text on the *Categories* as well as a number of tracts on grammar. Dawidh seems to have been concerned above all with basic phonology and even the cognitive aspects of linguistics,

> Speech is the turning of the tongue and the ordering of human words which are conceived in thought (*btrʿita*), born of cogitation (*men ḥušaba*), pressed forward to the opening by the understanding (*men huna*), and brought forth by the will,[38]

as well as with subjects of perennial interest to the Syrians such as the origins of the alphabet (the Syrians took the idea from the Hebrews, it having been given to Moses, in accordance with the story in Epiphanius). Again like other Syrians, Dawidh holds to a fundamentalist conception of language structure in which the relationship between *signifiant* and *signifié* is anything but arbitrary: the noun comes before the verb because it is natural that a cause should precede that which is caused—the subject must precede the predicate.[39]

Even in the period following Jacob of Edessa, Syriac grammar thus appears to have remained firmly connected with the *mašlmanuta*. Dawidh saw himself as one in a line of revered doctors, going back some 150 years or so to a certain Sabroy, to whom he attributes the invention of the masoretic marks and points.[40] While we know little of Sabroy, we do know rather more of his son Ramišoʿ, whose monkish wanderings Dawidh describes in some detail and the results of whose grammatical and lexicographical labours are to be found in red ink all over the enormous manuscript of the Eastern *mašlmanuta*.[41] We have remarked already that lexicography had its origins in the *mašlmanuta*, and Dawidh partook of this sphere too—the more comprehensive lexicons of the tenth century mention him as an authority from time to time.

The best known lexicographers of the same era, however, are the (already briefly mentioned) ʿEnanišoʿ and Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq. The former was an East Syrian monk who engaged in philosophy as well as lexicography as an aid to monastic discipline;[42] the latter is well known to Arabists for his other occupation in translating Greek (or Syriac) books for

38 R.J.H. Gottheil, "Dawidh bar Paulos, a Syriac Grammarian," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 15 (1893): cxii.

39 Ibid.: cxviii.

40 Ignatius Rahmani, ed., *Studia Syriaca I* (Lebanon, 1904), 44–46.

41 For the colophon to the ms describing his work, see Segal, *Diacritical Point*, 78–79.

42 He wrote his definitions and commentary on the walls of his monastic cell! See Thomas of Marga, *Book of Governors* (ed. E.W. Budge [London, 1893]), 80; trans., 178.

the Arabic scientific market. It is hardly surprising that one who spent so much time translating technical treatises, often from Greek into Syriac, should come to construct something like a dictionary of terms, perhaps for the use of his 'school'. To this extent at least Ḥunayn was a member of the Syrian school of grammar/lexicography. His (academic) grandfather had been the patriarch Išōʿ bar Nun, another author of a work of synonyms; and Ḥunayn's own work started by revising of the lexicon of ʿEnanišoʿ and ended with some larger work which received the praise of the Syriac lexicographers of the tenth century.[43] There is no doubt that Ḥunayn also took careful account of Arabic lexicography (al-Ḫalīli) and grammar (Sībawayhi) as well,[44] and so with him we begin to see the process of influence from Arabic into Syriac which would eventually result in Barhebraeus' synthesis of the Syriac grammatical tradition with the Arabic grammar of al-Zamaḫšarī, an influence that extended even to traditional Syriac strongholds such as phonology.[45]

5. A Different Line of Development? The Catholicos Timothy I

If we backtrack a little, however, into the period when Sībawayhi was still working on the *Kitāb*, we come across a fascinating letter in Syriac, written in 785 by the Catholicos (Patriarch) of the Church of the East, Timothy I, to his friend Sergius, head of the monastic school of Abraham in Mosul.[46] In this letter, which has only recently been shown for the important text that it is, Timothy explains to Sergius his plans for the construction of a scientifically-based Syriac grammar to rival the work that he sees has been done in the Greek and Arabic fields (and this some years before the publication of the *Kitāb*!). Timothy outlines an exacting method which he believes will provide a firm foundation for a Syriac linguistics.

Timothy displays an ambiguous attitude with regard to the earlier grammatical tradition—he sees that his mother tongue has both an abundance and a poverty of material and thinks that all previous attempts at

[43] J.G.E. Hoffmann, ed., *Syrisch-arabische Glossen* (Kiel, 1874), 2,5.

[44] His work was entitled كتاب احكام الاعراب على مذهب اليونانيين مقالتان. This was made use of by later Syriac grammarians, if not by Arab ones (Merx, Historia, 106).

[45] Ibid., ch.12.

[46] Timothy, *Ep.*19, Oskar Braun, ed., *Timothei patriarchae I: Epistulae I* (Louvain, 1914), 126–30, trans., 84–6. I follow the analysis provided in the excellent new study of Timothy's letters by Vittorio Berti, *Vita e Studi di Timoteo I Patriarca Cristiano di Baghdad* (Paris, 2009), 309–16, who has revealed so much material that previously lay unused in the tomb of a rather inaccessible old edition.

grammar have been superficial (one recalls that in the Church of the East, all grammar teaching was still based on Joseph Huzāyā's adaptation of the *Technē* and little of the richer reflections of Jacob of Edessa or John the Stylite may have reached Timothy) and yet to obtain texts with which to advance his learned project his first port of call was the library collections of the North Mesopotamian monasteries.[47] It was not only in the sphere of grammar that he sought learning from the north; Timothy recognized that this was a repository of Hellenistic science and education which he sought to tap into and relocate to new centres of power in the south.[48] To this extent, Timothy (and the other Syriac scholars of his century that have been mentioned) stood upon the cusp of two eras, able to look back with a degree of familiarity to a world of monastic schools which were still microcosms of the late antique system of higher education, as well as being able to catch glimpses of the wider horizons to come in ʿAbbāsid Baghdad.[49]

Timothy believed that every language had a 'characteristic form' and that this could be elucidated only by means of a thorough grammatical analysis based on *logical* principles. He therefore planned to investigate and analyse Syriac in accordance with an Aristotelian logical system. We should recall in this connection that Timothy was something of an expert on the *Organon* and had been commissioned by al-Mahdi to translate the *Topics* into Arabic; in fact, he here seems again to partake of the Syriac penchant for taking grammar and logic as two parts of a continuum. As a result, just as with all his compatriots, he naturally fell foul of the belief in the non-arbitrariness of signs and the fundamental existence of the letters as elements of reality ("the letters, he says, will be assigned to the foundational genera of things" Braun, p.127/8).[50]

---

[47] For instance, he seeks there Aristotle's (imaginary) second book of *Poetics*.

[48] Berti, *Timoteo I*, chs.3,4, remain the principal orientation on this topic. See also the evidence in e.g. S.P. Brock, "Two Letters of the Patriarch Timothy from the late eighth century on translations from Greek," *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 9 (1999).

[49] Syriac culture seems to have remained within its late antique bilingual frame until this time, but not after the end of the eighth century; Ḥunayn's translation activity already looked back to a time that had passed away, although it could hardly have grown up without presupposing it—Watt, "Grammar, Rhetoric, and the Enkyklios Paideia in Syriac," 50.

[50] See the comparable comments of Dawidh bar Paulos (Gottheil, «Dawidh bar Paulos, a Syriac Grammarian,» cxv-vi); Paul the Persian used such an approach to syllogistics, Hugonnard-Roche, *Logique d'Aristote*, 233–54, and «Du commentaire à la reconstruction: Paul le Perse interprète d'Aristote (sur une lecture du Peri Hermeneias, à propos des modes et des adverbes selon Paul, Ammonius et Boèce),» in *Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle*, ed. J.W. Watt and J. Lössl (Ashgate: 2011). In the *Cause de la fondation des écoles,*

He confesses that he conceives his plan as part of an ongoing interaction with certain 'scholars'. The term used here does not refer to any specific position within the Syrian churches and may well refer to Arabic-speaking scholars at the ʿAbbāsid court who had an interest in linguistics,[51] i.e. representatives of the so-called Old Iraqi school and indeed it is hard to see who else could be meant when he speaks about the jealousy he feels when he looks at the achievements of Arab grammarians. It remains an open possibility that this is the sort of "evidence for exchanges between Syriac scholars and early Arab grammarians"[52] which some have sought. The letter is strong testimony both to the existence and vivacity of that 'school' and to its interaction with the Syriac sphere at the very moment when the latter's epicentre was being shifted from the monasteries of the upper Tigris and Euphrates to the environs of Seleuceia and Baghdad.

The eighth century is thus a particularly 'busy' time in the history of Syriac grammar in both its eastern and western guises, such as would not be matched again until the eleventh and thirteenth centuries produced the classical compendia of Syriac grammar. The north Mesopotamian monasteries still interacted in a world involving Greek and Arabic in equal measure with Syriac (we have seen Jacob's travels to teach Greek; Timothy's researches in Syriac and Greek books from Mar Mattai and Mar Zina; Dawidh bar Paulos may have been responsible for the movement of Greek learning from the Euphrates to the Tigris regions too).[53] The grammarians of that age were heavily involved in the basic teaching and higher elaboration of Aristotelian logic, of which linguistics was seen as but one branch. They were also deeply committed to their ecclesiastical traditions and conceived the task of preserving their language as tied up with problems of religious identity in an age of transition and potential threat.

6. The Origins of Arabic Grammar

What are we to make then of the interrelationship between Syriac and Arabic grammatical systems during the formative age of the latter? We have seen that Talmon believed he had found some elements in the

---

Barḥadbešabba ʿArbaya equates the physical elements of the universe with those of the alphabet, Becker, *Fear of God*, 131.

[51] This is the suggestion of Berti, *Timoteo I*, 311.

[52] Carter in *EI*[2] IX,525a.

[53] Brock, "From Antagonism to Assimilation," 24–5.

grammar of Jacob paralleled in the Kufan/Old Iraqi school.[54] These minor conjectures are, however, insufficient evidence on which to ground any general reconstruction as to just how the early *naḥwiyyūn* might have taken material from Syriac grammatical textbooks. It must at all times be recalled that the Syriac tradition is only extant in very scattered fragments and large parts of our knowledge of that history are wholly absent, starting with most of the grammar of Jacob himself who was so influential both in his own day and beyond. It would be well nigh impossible to trace individual instances of influence.

We have seen that Syriac grammar was almost wholly focused on issues immediately arising from the pressing problem of preserving a liturgical language in the face of the natural processes of language change, and thus spent most of its energy on phonology and orthography (pointing). Within these limited fields there can be no doubt that the parallels between Arabic and Syriac traditions are not fortuitous. Parallels of this sort abound and should be a cause of no surprise. Let us enumerate a few of them:

1. Sībwayhi's use of *ḍaraba* "to strike" as his paradigmatic verb can hardly be unconnected with the fact that *tuptō* "to strike" was the verb of choice in all Greek grammars,[55] and *mḥā* "to strike" in Syriac.[56] Canons and lists containing such paradigms were two-a-penny in the late antique schools, whether Greek or Syriac.
2. Contrary to some modern opinion, it seems to me almost perverse to deny any organic relationship between Aristotle's division of all speech into nouns, verbs, and a third category of words with no signification,[57] and Sībawayhi's tripartite classification of nouns, verbs, and *ḥarf jāʾa li-maʿnan laisa b-ʾism wa lā fiʿil* "particles giving a meaning that is neither verb nor noun". The connection, however, did not arise through Sībawayhi's having read Aristotle (the argument about the relative dating of the *Kitāb* and the Arabic Aristotle being therefore irrelevant),

---

[54] See n.29 above. In his larger consideration of the question entitled *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar: a critical exploration of pre-Ḫalīlian Arabic linguistics* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), Rafael Talmon mentioned Dawidh bar Paulos briefly but otherwise does not much consider the question of Syriac influences.

[55] Originally in the appendix to the *Technē* (whence into Syriac) and then with every possible inflection in the Theodosian canons (fifth century), in Choeroboscos' ninth century commentary on the canons, and in Byzantine handbooks in general after that.

[56] Merx, *Historia*, 26.

[57] *Poetics* 1456b38–7a6. Is it significant that Timothy had read the *Poetics* (probably in Syriac) and that he viewed it as a work of logic, perhaps as part of the substructure for his proposed Grammar.

but through the logical compendia which littered the educational landscape of the late antique school system in Syriac and Greek and which often already drew grammar and logic into a single conceptual sphere.[58] For instance, Athanasius of Balad wrote in his *Introduction to Logic*, that "the principal parts of speech are the noun (lit., name) and the verb; then there are others some of which take on the character of a noun, others the character of a verb, and others by themselves indicate nothing at all."[59] Athanasius' handbook mixes grammar with logic in a manner typical of late antique philosophical pedagogy and his work can be shown to draw directly on Greek 'introductions' of the same type.[60]

3. The names of the vowels and simple phonetic terms.[61]
4. The manner in which diacritical points are used to represent those vowels.[62]
5. The *ḥurūf al-ʾiḍāfa* "particles of connection" are the equivalent of the Syriac letters B-D-W-L, which the Syriac grammarians used to parallel the notion of the Greek case system.[63]

It may be remarked that the question of Syriac 'influence' and that of Greek are not unrelated. If the Greek traditions exerted any force upon

58 Merx, *Historia*, 143, never suggested that Sībwayhi really did read Aristotle. He argued that this relationship was best viewed through the lens of Ammonius' commentary which makes clear just what Aristotle (was believed to have) meant by 'non-signifying'. Whilst Elamrani-Jamal, *Logique aristotélicienne et Grammaire arabe*, 21–35, is a pointed and right-minded critique of Merx's presuppositions, it by no means answers all of his concrete evidence. It was rather unfortunate that Elamrani-Jamal restricted his comments to a shorter summary Merx made in a later lecture rather than to the detailed discussion in his 1889 monograph. We simply take a more holistic view of the whole process rather than trying either to draw or erase direct lines of 'borrowing'. In the case of Sībawayhi, 'sources' are merely repositories of inspiration or starting-points.

59 G. Furlani, "Contributi alla storia della filosofia greca in Oriente, Testi siriaci, VI, Una introduzione alla logica aristotelica di Atanasio di Balad," *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei*, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, serie quinta, 25 (1916): 729,1–5.

60 As a comparison with the first part of John of Damascus' *Fount of Knowledge* will readily indicate. The two are both based on a lost source (in Greek) summarising the teaching of the Alexandrian schools of late antiquity.

61 As originally argued by Ignác Goldziher et al., *On the History of Grammar among the Arabs* (1994), 6–7, and shown now by K. Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar and Qur'anic Exegesis in Early Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 29–32.

62 Again Versteegh (see previous note). E.J. Revell, "The Diacritical Dots and the Development of the Arabic Alphabet," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20 (1975), showed long ago how the different Semitic systems of diacritics were organically related.

63 See Talmon's comment in S. Auroux, *History of the language sciences: an international handbook on the evolution of the study of language from the beginnings to the present* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000), I:249a. This was a masoretic concern, Merx, *Historia*, 30–31.

the early development of Arabic grammar, this must have come via the Syriac sphere, not by translations alone, but by an ongoing living tradition of grammar-teaching. With regard to no.3, it has been forcefully argued that Sībawayhi is making an analysis of the particles that is all his own and is not dependent on Aristotle.[64] Quite so; the content of the Arabic grammar was autochthonous, but the environment within which it was conceived and grew was no island. It is no coincidence that grammatical reflection developed out of the liturgical requirements of a religion 'of the book' at the same time (eighth century), in the same place (Mesopotamia), in three different languages (Syriac, Arabic, and Hebrew).

It should be stressed here also that the question of the whether the *Hintergrund* of Arabic grammar was Greek philosophy or Greek grammar evaporates when one appreciates the late antique context in which the former was conceived.[65] As Athanasius of Balad's *Introduction* illustrates, the two disciplines were drawn together in educational terms—Greek grammar drew on a Stoic reading of Aristotelian logic;[66] and Greek logical handbooks often included grammatical categories as if these were ontological.[67] The Syrians adopted both modes in their own version of

[64] K. Versteegh, *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 38–53.

[65] Merx argued for philosophy rather than grammar. Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar and Qur'anic Exegesis*, 26, suggests the opposite. For those still considering the important question of the extent of the Greek influence on early Arabic grammar, more account must be taken in the future of the Syriac handbooks. The old argument (J. Weiss, "Die arabische Nationalgrammatik und die Lateiner," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 64 (1910), repeated by, e.g., R. Baalbaki, "Introduction," in *The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), xxii) that Greek influence cannot have been present in the days of Sībawayhi does not hold in the face of our greater knowledge both of Syriac grammar and of philosophy; nor is there any real need to push the credentials of Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ in this regard (e.g. as F. Rundgren, "Über den griechischen Einfluss auf die arabische Nationalgrammatik," *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis* 2 (1976), and R. Talmon, "The Philosophizing Farra': An Interpretation of an Obscure Saying Attributed to the Grammarian Ta'lab," in *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II*, ed. M.G. Carter and K. Versteegh (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990), 270 etc.).

[66] P. Swiggers and A. Wouters, "Introduction," in *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*, ed. P. Swiggers and A. Wouters (Leuven: 2002). The philosophical basis is described by, e.g., M. Frede, "Principles of Stoic Grammar," in *The Stoics*, ed. J. Rist (Berkeley: Univ. California Press, 1978), and A.C. Lloyd, "Grammar and Metaphysics in the Stoa," in *Problems in Stoicism*, ed. J. Rist (London: Athlone Press, 1971). Anneli Luhtala, *Grammar and philosophy in late antiquity: a study of Priscian's sources* (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 2005), describes the process by which philosophical terminology had a growing influence on late antique grammatical handbooks.

[67] The basis for this goes back to Ammonius' *Commentary on the De Interpretatione*, in which the Alexandrian master conflates Aristotelian terminology with that of grammatical teaching, e.g. the passage at p.11,8–12,15 (A. Busse, ed., *Ammonius in Aristotelis de interpretatione commentarius*, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca IV,5 [Berlin: Reimer, 1897]).

Greek higher education, and thus even a dichotomy between a 'Greek' thesis and a 'Syriac' thesis lies more in the mind of the modern scholar than in the sources.[68]

That the early Arab grammarians derived such phenomena as those listed above from the elementary teaching of the Syriac schools is hardly surprising. These had long before assimilated and watered down much of the philosophical and grammatical teaching of the old Alexandrian masters. Syriac manuscripts of the era are so full of 'introductions' like the above-mentioned by Athanasius of Balad, that the *naḥwiyyun* would have been hard pressed to avoid them. The genius of Sībawayhi was no less a genius for having been a phenomenon of its age, nurtured and rooted in a fecund environment in which the fires of Greek *paideia* had yet completely to fade away.

For the essence of Arabic grammar was, as we have said, certainly its own. The presence of elements from other traditions amounts to neither influence nor borrowing.[69] Indeed Sībawayhi treated the task of grammar quite differently from the Syrians (and Hebrews). The Syriac writers, for instance, never interpreted their own language according to the triliteral-root system as was the case in Arabic grammar from its inception.[70] The Syrians also followed the Greek and Hebrew traditions in concerning themselves almost exclusively with the written language and worked on the assumption that this written language was the 'given' in need of careful preservation.[71] Sībawayhi's turn to the spoken word of the Bedouin shows another mind at work. Maybe Timothy was already aware of this interest in the tribal *ʾiʿrāb* "Arabism" when he sought to find Syriac's own 'characteristic form',[72] its own tribal nature that would give it a specific

---

[68] J.W. Watt, "al-Farabi and the History of the Syriac Organon," in *Malphono w-Rabo d-Malphone. Studies in Honor of Sebastian P. Brock*, ed. G. Kiraz (Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2008), argues for a partial collapsing of the Greek/Syriac distinction within the transmission of logical texts.

[69] K. Versteegh, "Borrowing and Influence: Greek Grammar as a Model," in *Le langage dans l'Antiquité*, ed. P. Swiggers and A. Wouters (Leuven: 1990).

[70] G. Bohas, «Le traitement de la conjugaison du syriaque chez Bar Zu'bi: une langue sémitique dans le mirroir de la grammaire grecque,» in *Actes du Colloque 'Patrimoine Syriaque' IX* (Damascus: 2004), online at http://ens-web3.ens-lsh.fr/gbohas/tme. For the alternatives in use among the Syrians see the other work of this scholar, especially «Radical ou racine/schème, l'organisation de la conjugaison syriaque avant l'adoption de la racine,» *Le Muséon* 116 (2003), 343–76.

[71] A. Moberg, *Buch der Strahlen, die grössere Grammatik des Barhebräus* (Leipzig, 1907,1913), 18*. For the Hebrew, the contribution by G. Khan in the present volume.

[72] Elamrani-Jamal, *Logique aristotélicienne et Grammaire arabe*, 34–5, is right to break any connection between *ʾiʿrāb* and *hellenismos*. The notion that grammar is about the 'preservation' of 'correct' forms is so nearly universal as hardly to require an external origin.

identity in a new era. The interaction between Arabic and Syriac grammar in later ages meant that 'grammar' would forever be a nationalistic issue.

It is clear, then, that any account of the rise of Arabic linguistics must take account of the incontrovertible fact that northern Mesopotamia (and by Timothy's date Baghdad as well) was in the eighth century a fertile ground indeed for grammatical and linguistic study, in Greek as well as in Syriac. We have seen too how this tradition was carried on largely in a monastic and pedagogical context—not in a reclusive manner, for the Syrian scholars were *au fait* with the very latest Greek science.[73] Hence the close connection between 'linguistics' and the public recitation and exegesis of scripture must also be allowed to control how we perceive this tradition. Almost all Syrian grammarians appear to be connected in some way with the *mašlmanuta*, the tradition of annotating Biblical codices with marks for accentuation and vowel quality and at the same time producing subsidiary lists of difficult words, grammatical explanations etc. That Arabic grammar emerged out of Islamic exegesis, and especially out of the process of public reading, is hardly a fortuitous parallel, given the central role of religious professionals within both spheres. We have seen evidence that Syrian teachers sometimes even taught Arabic pupils the art of reading, and Arabic vowel marking seems indebted to its Syrian forerunners.[74] What do the Arabic *qāriʾūn* (or, *muqriʾūn*) owe to the traditions of the Syrian *maqreyyānē*? Of course, if the *qāriʾūn* and their successors in Kufa were as mistaken in their whole conception of Arabic linguistics as the later tradition supposed, then the Syriac influence upon them may actually have been a negative one.[75]

---

73 For the importance of the monastic context in the transmission of philosophy 'from Alexandria to Baghdad', see J.W. Watt, "Von Alexandrien nach Bagdad. Ein erneuter Besuch bei Max Meyerhof," in *Origenes und seine Bedeutung für die Theologie- und Geistesgeschichte Europas und des Vorderen Orients*, ed. A. Fürst (Münster: 2010), and J.W. Watt, "From Sergius to Matta. Commentary and Translation in Syriac Aristotelian and Monastic Tradition," in *Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle*, ed. J.W. Watt and J. Lössl (Ashgate: 2011).

74 Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar and Qur'anic Exegesis*, 29; Merx, *Historia*, 43.

75 If the role of the *qāriʾūn/muqriʿūn* and *maqreyyānē* were seen as one and the same, then a locus for the exchange of ideas can be found. There is, however, no evidence known to me that such an identity was ever made.

References

Primary Sources

Ammonius, *In De Interpretatione*:
Busse, A. *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca IV, 5*. Berlin, 1897.
Aristotle, *Categories*:
King, Daniel. *The Earliest Syriac Translation of Aristotle's Categories*, *Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
Athanasius of Balad, *Introduction to Logic*:
Furlani, G. "Contributi alla storia della filosofia greca in Oriente, Testi siriaci, VI, Una introduzione alla logica aristotelica di Atanasio di Balad." *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei*, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, serie quinta, 25 (1916): 717–78.
Bar-ʿAli, *Lexicon*:
Hoffmann, J.G.E. *Syrisch-arabische Glossen*. Kiel, 1874.
Barhebraeus, *Chronicle*:
Abbeloos, J.B., and T.J. Lamy. *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*. London and Paris, 1877.
Barhebraeus, *Grammar*:
Moberg, A. *Buch der Strahlen, die grössere Grammatik des Barhebräus*. Leipzig, 1907, 1913.
Dionysius Thrax:
Uhlig, G. *Dionysii Thracis Ars Gramamtica*, *Grammatici Graeci I*. Leipzig, 1883.
Jacob of Edessa. *Letter to John the Stylite*:
Schröter, R. "Erster Brief Jackob's von Edessa an Johannes den Styliten." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 24 (1875): 261–300.
Jacob of Edessa. *On Orthography*:
Phillips, G. *A Letter by Mar Jacob, Bishop of Edessa, on Syriac orthography*. London, 1869.
John the Stylite, *Grammar*:
Moberg, A. "Die syrische grammatik des Johannes Estonaja." *Le monde oriental* 3 (1909): 24–33.
Michael Syncellus:
Donnet, D. *Le traité de la construction de la phrase de Michael Syncelle de Jérusalem*, *Études de Philologie, d'Archéologie et d'Histoire anciennes, Institut historique belge de Rome 22*. Brussels, 1982.
Thomas of Marga:
Budge, E. Wallis. *The Book of Governors: the Historia Monastica of Thomas bishop of Marga*. London, 1893.
Timothy I. Letters:
Braun, Oskar. *Timothei patriarchae I: Epistulae I, CSCO 74 (Scr.Syr.30)*. Louvain, 1914.
Brock, Sebastian P. "Two Letters of the Patriarch Timothy from the late eighth century on translations from Greek." *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 9 (1999): 233–46.
Varia:
Hoffmann, J.G.E. *Opuscula Nestoriana*. Kiel, 1880.
Rahmani, Ignatius. *Studia Syriaca I*. Lebanon, 1904.

Secondary Sources

Auroux, S. *History of the language sciences: an international handbook on the evolution of the study of language from the beginnings to the present*, *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000.
Baalbaki, R. "Introduction," in *The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition*, xiii–xlii. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
Balzaretti, C. "Ancient Treatises on Syriac Homonyms." *Oriens Christianus* 89 (1997): 73–81.

Baumstark, A. *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*. Bonn, 1922.
Becker, A.H. *The Fear of God and the Beginning of Wisdom: the School of Nisibis and the development of scholastic culture in late antique Mesopotamia*. Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
Berti, V. *Vita e Studi di Timoteo I Patriarca Cristiano di Baghdad*, *Studia Iranica 41*. Paris, 2009.
Bohas, G. "Radical ou racine/schème, l'organisation de la conjugaison syriaque avant l'adoption de la racine." *Le Muséon* 116 (2003): 343–76.
——, "Le traitement de la conjugaison du syriaque chez Bar Zu'bi: une langue sémitique dans le mirroir de la grammaire grecque." In *Actes du Colloque 'Patrimoine Syriaque' IX*. Damascus, 2004.
Brock, S.P. "From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac attitudes to Greek learning." In *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, edited by N. Garsoïan, T. Matthews and R. Thomson, 17–32. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1982.
Contini, R. "Considerazioni interlinguistiche sull'adattamento siriaco della 'Techne Grammatike' di Dionisio Trace." In *La diffusione dell'eredità classica nell'età tardoantica e medievale. Il Romanzo di Alessandro e altri scritti*, edited by B.M. Finazzi and A. Valvo, 95–111. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1998.
Elamrani-Jamal, A. *Logique aristotélicienne et Grammaire arabe*. Paris: Vrin, 1983.
Frede, M. "Principles of Stoic Grammar." In *The Stoics*, edited by J. Rist, 27–75. Berkeley: Univ. California Press, 1978.
Goldziher, I. *On the History of Grammar among the Arabs*, *Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 73*. Translated by D. Kinga, and I. Tamas, 1994.
Gottheil, R.J.H. "Dawidh bar Paulos, a Syriac Grammarian." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 15 (1893): cxi–cxviii.
Hugonnard-Roche, H. *La Logique d'Aristote du grec au syriaque : Études sur la Transmission des Textes de l'Organon et leur Interpretation philosophique*. Paris: Vrin, 2004.
——, "Le Vocabulaire philosophique de l'être en syriaque, d'après des textes de Sergius de Res'aina et Jacques d'Édesse." In *Arabic Theology, Arabic Philosophy. From the Many to the One: Essays in Celebration of Richard M. Frank*, edited by J.E. Montgomery, 101–25. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
——, "Du commentaire à la reconstruction: Paul le Perse interprète d'Aristote (sur une lecture du Peri Hermeneias, à propos des modes et des adverbes selon Paul, Ammonius et Boèce)." In *Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle*, edited by John W. Watt and J. Lössl 207–224. Ashgate, 2011.
Ibrahim, G.Y. and Kiraz, G, (eds.). *Studies on Jacob of Edessa*, *Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 25*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2010.
Jones, F.S. "Early Syriac Pointing in and behind British Museum Additional Manuscript 12,150," in *Symposium Syriacum VII*, edited by R. Lavenant, 429–44. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1998.
King, D. "The Genesis and Development of a Logical Lexicon in the Syriac Tradition:" In *Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle*, edited by John W. Watt and J. Lossl, 225–37. Ashgate, 2011.
——, "Grammar and Logic in Syriac (and Arabic)." (Forthcoming in *Journal of Semitic Studies*).
Lloyd, A.C. "Grammar and Metaphysics in the Stoa." In *Problems in Stoicism*, edited by J. Rist, 58–74. London: Athlone Press, 1971.
Loopstra, J. *Patristic Selections in the 'Masoretic' Handbooks of the Qarqaptā Tradition*, *CSCO Subsidia*. Leuven: Peeters, Forthcoming.
——, "A Syriac Tract for the 'Explanation' of Hebrew and Foreign Words." In *The Old Testament as Authoritative Scripture in the Early Churches of the East*, edited by V.S. Hovhannessian, 57–64. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.

Luhtala, A. *Grammar and philosophy in late antiquity: a study of Priscian's sources*, *Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science Series III, Studies in the history of the language sciences*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 2005.
Martin, J.P.P. "Tradition karkaphienne, ou la massore chez les Syriens." *Journal Asiatique* 6,14 (1869): 245–379.
——, "Histoire de la ponctuation, ou de la massore chez les Syriens." *Journal Asiatique* 7,5 (1875): 81–208.
Merx, A. *Historia artis grammaticae apud Syros*, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes IX,2*. Leipzig, 1889.
Revell, E.J. "The Grammar of Jacob of Edessa and the Other Near Eastern Grammatical Traditions." *Parole de L'Orient* 3 (1972): 365–74.
——, "Aristotle and the Accents: The Categories of Speech in Jewish and other authors." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 19, no. 1 (1974): 19–35.
——, "The Diacritical Dots and the Development of the Arabic Alphabet." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20 (1975): 178–90.
——, "Hebrew Accents and Greek Ekphonetic Neumes." In *Studies in Eastern Chant IV*, edited by Milos Velimirovic. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979, 140–70.
Romeny, B. Ter Haar, ed. *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of his Day*, *Monographs of the Peshitta Institute 18*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
Rundgren, F. "Über den griechischen Einfluss auf die arabische Nationalgrammatik." *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis* 2 (1976): 119–44.
Segal, J.B. *The Diacritical Point and the Accents in Syriac*. London, 1953.
Swiggers, P., and A. Wouters. "Introduction." *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*, edited by P. Swiggers and A. Wouters, 9–20. Leuven, 2002.
Talmon, R. "The Philosophizing Farrāʾ: An Interpretation of an Obscure Saying Attributed to the Grammarian Ṯaʿlab." In *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II*, edited by M.G. Carter and K. Versteegh, 265–79. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990.
——, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar: a critical exploration of pre-Ḫalīlian Arabic linguistics*, *Harvard Semitic Museum publications*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
——, "Jacob of Edessa the Grammarian," in *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day*, edited by B. Ter Haar Romeny, 159–87. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
Versteegh, K. *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking*, *Studies in Semitic Language and Linguistics VII*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
——, "Borrowing and Influence: Greek Grammar as a Model." In *Le langage dans l'Antiquité*, edited by P. Swiggers and A. Wouters, 197–212. Leuven, 1990.
——, *Arabic Grammar and Qur'anic Exegesis in Early Islam*, *Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics XIX*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
Watt, J.W. "Grammar, Rhetoric, and the Enkyklios Paideia in Syriac." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 143 (1993): 45–71.
——, "al-Farabi and the History of the Syriac Organon," in *Malphono w-Rabo d-Malphone. Studies in Honor of Sebastian P. Brock*, edited by G. Kiraz 751–78. Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2008.
——, "Von Alexandrien nach Bagdad. Ein erneuter Besuch bei Max Meyerhof." In *Origenes und seine Erbe in Orient und Okzident*, edited by A. Fürst, 213–226. Münster, 2010.
——, "From Sergius to Matta. Commentary and Translation in Syriac Aristotelian and Monastic Tradition." In *Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle*, edited by John W. Watt and J. Lössl, 239–57. Ashgate, 2011.
Weiss, J. "Die arabische Nationalgrammatik und die Lateiner." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 64 (1910): 349–90.

THE MEDIEVAL KARAITE TRADITION OF HEBREW GRAMMAR

Geoffrey Khan

Introduction

In recent years, important advances have been made in our knowledge concerning the contribution of the medieval Karaites to the study of the Hebrew language. This has been largely due to the discovery and investigation of a range of new manuscript sources. A large number of these sources are in the Firkovitch collections of manuscripts that are in the posssession of the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg. These collections were acquired in the nineteenth century by the famous Karaite bibliophile Abraham Firkovitch (1787–1874) but have only been made fully available to international scholarship in the last few years. The manuscripts relating to the linguistic activities of the Karaites are found mainly in the so called second Firkovitich collection, which was acquired by Firkovitch in the Near East between the years 1863 and 1865. It consists of more than 15,000 items, including Hebrew, Arabic, Judaeo-Arabic and Samaritan manuscripts. The majority of the collection appears to have originated from the Karaite synagogue in Cairo.[1] Some important manuscript sources relating to this field have been preserved also in other collections, especially those of the British Library in London, and in the Cairo Genizah.

The key figures in the history of Karaite grammatical thought whose works have come down to us from the Middle Ages are ʾAbū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ and ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn ibn Faraj. These two scholars belonged to the Karaite community of Jerusalem.

[1] For the background of the acquisition of the second Firkovitch collection see T. Harviainen, "Abraham Firkovitsh, Karaites in Hīt, and the provenance of Karaite transcriptions of Biblical Hebrew texts in Arabic script" (*Studies in Memory of Andrej Czapkiewicz*, 1. Folia Orientalia 28 (Wroclaw, Warszawa and Kraków, 1991), "The Cairo Genizot and other sources of the second Firkovich collection in St. Petersburg" in E.J. Revell (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of the International Organization for Masoretic Studies* (Atlanta, 1996) and Abraham Firkovich and the Karaite community in Jerusalem in 1864," *Manuscripta Orientalia* 4/2. Russian Academy of Sciences. The Institute of Oriental Studies. St. Petersburg Branch, (1998), n.7.

1. Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ and the Early Karaite Grammatical Tradition

Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ's work is datable to the second half of the tenth century. The surviving works that are explicitly attributed to him in the colophons all have the form of Biblical commentaries. These include commentaries that are primarily exegetical in nature, a commentary that is concerned primarily with translation and a grammatical commentary.[2]

Ibn Nūḥ was heir to a tradition of Hebrew grammar that had developed among the Karaites of Iraq and Iran. This was brought to Jerusalem in the migrations of Karaites from the East during the tenth century. Ibn Nūḥ himself was an immigrant from Iraq. I shall refer to this grammatical tradition as the early Karaite tradition of Hebrew grammatical thought. ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn continued some of the elements of this tradition, but was innovative in many ways, both in method and content.

During most of his adult life ʾAbū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ (known in Hebrew as Joseph ben Noaḥ) resided in Palestine. According to Ibn al-Hītī, who wrote a chronicle of Karaite scholars, he had a college (*dār li-l-ʿilm*) in Jerusalem, which appears to have been established around the end of the tenth century.[3]

One Hebrew grammatical text that is attributed to Yūsuf Ibn Nūḥ is extant. This work is referred to in the colophons either simply as the *Diqduq* or as *Nukat Diqduq* 'Points of Grammar'.[4] In what follows I shall refer to it by its shorter title. It is written in Arabic, though much of the technical terminology is Hebrew.

ʾAbū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ is likely to be identical with ʾAbū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf ibn Baḵtawaih (or Baḵtawi) who is mentioned in some sources. Baḵtawaih may have been the Iranian equivalent of the name Nūḥ or Noaḥ (cf. Persian *baḫt* 'fortune, prosperity'). Yūsuf ibn Baḵtawaih is stated to have been a grammarian who composed a book called *al-Diqduq*. There are references to the *ḥaṣer* ('compound') of Ibn Baḫtawaih, which is likely to be identical with Ibn Nūḥ's college, referred to by Ibn al-Hītī by the

2 For further details see G. Khan, *The Early Karaite Tradition of Hebrew Grammatical Thought: Including a Critical Edition, Translation and Analysis of the Diqduq of ʾAbū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ*. (Leiden, 2000a), introduction.

3 For the text of Ibn al-Hītī see G. Margoliouth, "Ibn al-Hītī's Arabic Chronicle of Karaite Doctors." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 9 (1897): 433; 438–9. Ibn al-Hītī was writing in the fifteenth century. For the background of Ibn Nūḥ's college, see J. Mann, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, (Philadelphia, 1935) 2, 33–4.

4 A critical edition of Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq* to the Hagiographa with an analysis of its content is presented in Khan, *Karaite Tradition*.

corresponding Arabic term *dār*.[5] Ibn Baḵtawaih is described as 'the Babylonian' and 'teacher of the diaspora' (*muʿallim al-jāliya*), which indicates that his career had begun in Iraq.[6]

The *Diqduq* of Ibn Nūḥ is not a systematically arranged description of the Hebrew language with the various aspects of grammar presented in separate chapters but rather a series of grammatical notes on the Bible, together with sporadic exegetical comments. Occasionally a general principle of grammar is discussed, but in most cases grammatical concepts are not explained and their sense must be inferred from the context in which they are used. The work covers the entire Bible, selecting words and phrases that are deemed to require elucidation and analysis. It consists of a series of entries headed by a phrase from a Biblical verse that constitutes the subject of the comment. The entries are arranged according to the order of verses in the Biblical text. By no means all verses, however, are commented upon. The work was clearly intended to be used as an aid to the reading of the Bible. It does not offer instruction on the rudiments of Hebrew grammar but rather concentrates on points that Ibn Nūḥ believed may be problematic for the reader or concerning which there was controversy. As is the case with many of the Karaite philological works, some of the extant manuscripts of the *Diqduq* contain an abridged version of the original text.

The main concern of the *Diqduq* is the analysis and explanation of word structure. On various occasions aspects of phonology and also the syntactic and rhetorical structure of a verse are taken into account, but this is generally done as a means of elucidating the form of a word. The pronunciation of the letters and vowels or syntactic structures are rarely, if ever, the primary focus of attention. There is no systematic treatment of syntax or rhetorical structures. The *Diqduq*, therefore, is not a comprehensive grammar of Hebrew, either in its arrangement or in its content. It concentrates on what are regarded as problematic grammatical issues. This is reflected in the title of the work *Nukat Diqduq*, which is found in

[5] Cf. P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, Stuttgart (1927–1930), 6 and J. Mann, Jewish *History*, 31.

[6] S. Pinsker, *Lickute Kadmoniot. Zur Geschichte des Karaismus und der karäischen Literatur*. Wien (1860), 62, Mann, *Jewish History*, 30. Note, however, that according to Ibn al-Hītī, Ibn Nūḥ lived in Jerusalem for thirty years (Margoliouth, "Arabic Chronicle," 433). The source published by Pinsker refers to a 'Book of Precepts' (*sefer miṣwot*) of Yūsuf ibn Baẖtawaih. This, however, is thought by some to be a mistake of the author; cf. S. Poznański, "Aboul-Faradj Haroun ben al-Faradj le grammarien de Jérusalem et son Mouschtamil," *Revue des Études Juives*, 30 (1896b), 215, n.4 and S.L. Skoss, *The Arabic Commentary of ʿAli ben Suleimān the Karaite on the Book of Genesis* (Philadelphia, 1928), 6–7.

one manuscript.[7] The Arabic term *nukat* can have the sense of 'questions, difficult points' or 'notes explaining difficulties'.[8] These problematic issues are generally referred to as *masāʾil* (singular *masʾala* 'question') within the text of the *Diqduq*.

In his analysis of word structure, Ibn Nūḥ attempted to find consistent rules governing the formation of words. The ultimate purpose of his grammatical activity was the application of grammatical analysis in order to elucidate the precise meaning of the Biblical text and to demonstrate that there was nothing random or inconsistent about the language of the Bible. Differences in forms must be explained by positing differences in the process of derivation. The aim was to show that the language had a completely rational basis in its structure and differences in structure were in principle rationally motivated and intended to convey differences in meaning.

In the system of derivational morphology that is presented by Ibn Nūḥ, most inflected verbal forms are derived from an imperative base form. The imperative base is not an abstraction but is a real linguistic form. In some cases the imperative form that is posited as the base of an inflected verb does not actually occur in the language, e.g. נְתֹן *nəṯōn* for נָתַנּוּ *nā̊ṯannū* 'we gave' (1 Chron. 29:14), הֲלֹךְ *hălōḵ* for תִּהֲלַךְ *tihălaḵ* 'it (fs.) goes' (Psa. 73:9) and בַּקְשֵׁה *baqšē* for בִּקְשָׁה *biqšā̊* 'it (fs.) has sought' (Ecc. 7:28). The motivation for positing an imperative base such as בַּקְשֵׁה *baqšē* is to present the derivation of the form בִּקְשָׁה *biqšā̊*, without the dagesh in the *qoph*, as fully regular and not an anomalous inflection of the imperative base בַּקֵּשׁ *baqqēš* with *dageš*. The result of this process was that Ibn Nūḥ extended the language beyond what is found in the extant corpus of the Bible. The new forms that were postulated in this way were not intended to be used for the writing of creative literature. Indeed no Karaite author has been found who used these postulated forms in a creative Hebrew text. The purpose of the expansion of the language was rather to clarify and explain the Biblical Hebrew language rationally.

In a few cases the base of a form that has the appearance of a verb is a noun. Ibn Nūḥ explains small differences in some forms by proposing that one form is derived from an imperative whereas the other is derived from a noun. In the class of verbs which we refer to as final geminates, for example, there is variation in the position of stress in the past forms,

[7] II Firk. Evr. Arab. I 1759, fol. 1a.
[8] Cf. R. Dozy, *Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes*. 3rd edition, (Leiden: Paris, 1967) 2, 720.

e.g. קָ֣לּוּ *qállū* 'they are swift' (Job 9:25) vs. קַלּ֞וּ *qallū́* 'they are swift' (Hab. 1:8). According to Ibn Nūḥ this is not an arbitrary variation, but rather the forms with the penultimate stress are derived from a noun base whereas the forms with final stress have an imperative base.

Differences in form also had significance on the level of meaning. The distinction in the types of base of forms such as קָ֣לּוּ *qállū* and קַלּ֞וּ *qallū́*, for example, should be reflected in their Arabic translation (*tafsīr*), one being translated with a nominal adjective form and one by a verbal form.

Another dimension of structural variation that Ibn Nūḥ believed should be taken into account when interpreting the text was the distinction between pausal and context forms. The use of a pausal form of a word was interpreted as having the purpose of performing a particular function on the level of meaning, namely the expression of some kind of semantic disjunction. In many cases, for example, a pausal form is said to mark the boundary between a statement and an elaborative comment that supplies the reason or justification for what precedes. In conformity with this principle Psa. 93:1 יְהוָ֣ה מָלָךְ֮ גֵּא֪וּת לָ֫בֵ֥שׁ *yhwh mā̊lā̊ḵ gēʾūṯ lā̊ḇēš*, in which the verb מָלָךְ֮ *mā̊lā̊ḵ* is a pausal form, is interpreted as having the sense of 'The Lord has become king, for he is clothed in majesty', i.e. what shows his kingship is the fact that he is clothed in majesty.[9]

A similar concern with demonstrating the rationale behind the structure of the language of the Hebrew Bible on the level of discourse interconnectivity is exhibited by Ibn Nūḥ in an exegetical commentary on the Pentateuch, which has come down to us in an adaptation made by his pupil Abū al-Faraj Hārūn. In this commentary, which has recently been studied in detail by Miriam Goldstein,[10] there are numerous observations regarding the function of discourse structure, especially regarding the ordering of verses. This concern for demonstrating the rationale of compositional structure is, indeed, found in the works of other Karaite exegetes of the period.

---

[9] See G. Khan, "Biblical exegesis and grammatical theory in the Karaite tradition," in G. Khan (ed.), *Exegesis and Grammar in Medieval Karaite Texts* (Oxford, 2001), "Conjoining according to medieval Karaite grammatical theory," in A. Maman, S. Fassberg and Y. Breuer (eds.), Sha'arei Lashon: *Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 2007).

[10] M. Goldstein, The Pentateuch exegesis of the Karaites Yusuf ibn Nūḥ and ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn: an examination of method in the context of the contemporaneous literary and exegetical approaches of Jews, Christians and Muslims, Ph.D. thesis (Jerusalem, Hebrew University, 2006).

The *Diqduq* of Ibn Nūḥ is the earliest extant text that can be identified with certainty as a Karaite grammatical work. Ibn Nūḥ, however, was certainly not the earliest Karaite grammarian. Other Karaite scholars of his generation wrote grammatical works. Judah Hadassi, for instance, refers to a grammar book of Sahl ben Maṣliaḥ.[11] A number of grammatical concepts are found in the Bible commentaries of Yefet ben ʿEli. Ibn Nūḥ himself refers to other anonymous scholars (*ʿulamāʾ*) of grammar. Indeed some anonymous Karaite Bible commentaries that are extant contain grammatical concepts relating to the early Karaite tradition, such as a commentary on Hosea that has been reconstructed from Genizah fragments by Friedrich Niessen. Some of the grammarians mentioned by Ibn Nūḥ are referred to as deceased.[12] ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn attributes some grammatical concepts to the teachings of earlier Karaite grammarians in Iraq.[13] The traditions of this earlier Iraqi school described by ʾAbū al-Faraj correspond closely to what we find in Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq*. Ibn Nūḥ was an immigrant to Palestine from Iraq, where he was, it seems, a pupil of the Iraqi circle of Karaite grammarians.

According to a passage in one anonymous medieval Karaite source, the discipline of grammar began in Iṣfahān.[14] The Karaite al-Qirqisānī, writing in the first half of the tenth century, refers to Hebrew grammarians from Iṣfahān, Tustār and Baṣra.[15] This indicates that already during the time of Saadya Gaon Karaite schools of grammar were well developed in Iran. The teachings of the early Karaite grammarians of Iran are also referred to in an anonymous Karaite grammatical text that was written in the eleventh century. These are referred to in the past tense, which implies that they were active at a period that predated that of the author.[16]

---

11 *Eshkol ha-Kopher*, 167, letter *šin*, 173, letter *ṣade*.

12 E.g. II Firk. Evr. Arab. I 4323, fol. 9a: *hāḏā huwa maḏhab baʿḍ al-ʿulamāʾ raḥimahu ʾallāh* 'This is the opinion of one of the sages, God have mercy upon him', where the blessing *raḥimah ʾmahāh* suggests that the man in question is deceased.

13 E.g. *al-Kitāb al-Kāfī* (ed. Khan, Gallego and Olszowy-Schlanger, II.16.12): *ʾallaḏī ḏahaba ʾilā ḏālika . . . min al-diqdūqiyyīna qawm min al-ʿirāqiyyīna* 'those who have held this opinion from among the Hebrew grammarians are a group of the Iraqis'; *ḏālika qad taqaḍḍāhu baʿḍ al-diqdūqiyyīna min mašāyiḫinā al-ʿirāqiyyīna raḥimahum ʾallāh* 'This has been undertaken by Hebrew grammarians among our Iraqi elders, may God have mercy upon them' (I.22.55).

14 Mann, *Jewish History*, 104–5.

15 *Kitāb al-ʾAnwār wa-l-Marāqib*, L. Nemoy (ed.), vol. 1, chapter 17, 140.

16 See N. Vidro, "A Newly Reconstructed Karaite Work On Hebrew Grammar," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 54 (2009a). The text, which has been identified by Vidro as *Kitāb al-ʿUqūd fī Taṣārīf al-Luġa al-ʿIbrāniyya* ('Book of the Connections with regard to the Grammatical Inflections of the Hebrew Language') mentions on a number of occasions the grammatical teachings of the *ʿajam* (i.e. Persians). For further details on this text see below.

Some fragments of Hebrew grammatical texts that are written in Judaeo-Persian have, indeed, been preserved in the Cairo Genizah. These include fragments of a text that clearly belongs to the early Karaite tradition of grammar. This text is a grammatical commentary on the Bible that is very close, both in format and content, to the *Diqduq* of Ibn Nūḥ. The theory of grammar is virtually identical to that of the *Diqduq*. The derivative base of verbs is said to be imperative forms. It is likely to be a product of the early Iranian schools of Karaite grammar, which appear also to have been the ultimate source of the grammatical tradition that is reflected in Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq*.[17] A further source demonstrating the Iranian background of the early Karaite grammatical tradition is a Judaeo-Persian commentary on Ezekiel that was published recently by Thamar Gindin (2007). This text, although primarily exegetical in nature, contains several grammatical comments that exhibit a grammatical terminology and theory and a style of presentation that conform to what is found in Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq*.

According to a statement by ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn, the practice of deriving verbal inflections from the imperative, which was the hallmark of the early Karaite grammatical tradition, was also followed by the Kūfan school of Arabic grammar.[18] It is not possible, however, to identify such a practice in the extant Arabic grammatical literature and it is not at all clear that it is a concept that is borrowed from Arabic grammatical thought. The concept may, indeed, reflect the Iranian background of the Karaite tradition, in that in Middle and New Persian the imperative form has a clearer structural relationship to both the present and past forms of the verb than in Hebrew and Arabic, e.g. New Persian kardan 'to do': *kar* (imperative base), *mi-kar-* (present base), *kard* (past base).

The Hebrew term *diqduq* is found in sources predating the rise of Hebrew grammatical thought. In Rabbinic literature the verbal form diqdeq is used in the sense of attention to fine details of pronunciation and also with the meaning of 'investigating thoroughly' the content of Scripture.[19] The verbal noun *diqduq* is often used in Rabbinic literature in the sense of 'the details that are revealed by careful investigation', e.g. *diqduqe ha-torah* 'minute details of biblical exposition'.[20] Among the texts

---

[17] The text is published in Khan, *Early Karaite Grammatical Texts* (Atlanta, 2000b).

[18] See Khan "ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn and the early Karaite grammatical tradition," *The Journal of Jewish Studies* 48 (1997), 318–325.

[19] Babylonian Talmud, Baba Qama 38a.

[20] Babylonian Talmud, Sukkah 28a, Megillah 19a. Cf. W. Bacher *Die Älteste Terminologie der Jüdischen Schriftauslegung. Ein Wörterbuch der Bibelexegetischen Kunstsprachen der Tannaiten* (Leipzig, 1899), 23–24.

relating to the activities of the Masoretes, the term is used in the title of the most famous collection of masoretic rules, the *Diqduqe ha-Ṭeʿamim* compiled by Aharon ben Asher.[21] This refers to the subtle details of the use of accents in Scripture. The author assumes that the general rules are known and focuses on the fine points and the exceptions to the general principles.[22]

The title of Ibn Nūḥ's work, the *Diqduq* seems to have retained the sense of 'investigating the fine points of Scripture' and did not denote simply 'investigation of the language'. The discipline of *diqduq* as reflected in Ibn Nūḥ's work concentrated on selected details in the analysis of Scripture. It was concerned mainly with the details that were judged to be problematic and in need of particular attention, which are general referred to as *masāʾil* ('questions', 'issues'). Ibn Nūḥ assumed that the general rules of the language were already known to his audience.

When discussing such *masāʾil*, Ibn Nūḥ frequently cited various alternative opinions. Some of these may have reflected the differing opinions of scholars who were active in the Karaite grammatical circles in the tenth century. It is likely, however, that in most cases the primary purpose of the proposal of such alternatives is pedagogical, in that it was a method of inviting the reader to explore a variety of possibilities without them being necessarily attributable to any particular scholar. It encouraged enquiry and engagement rather than passive acceptance of authority. Indeed the text of Ibn Nūḥ's work appears to be closely associated with the oral teaching of grammar in the school roomrather than drawing on a preceding written source.

In the early Karaite tradition, therefore, *diqduq* was a method of investigating Scripture by the study of the subtle details of its language. The purpose of this investigation was both to establish the fine details of its meaning and also to demonstrate that the language conformed to a logical system.

The discipline of *diqduq* as exhibited by the work of Ibn Nūḥ was closely associated with the activity of the Masoretes, who applied themselves to the study of the details of the reading tradition and written transmission of the Biblical text. A central feature of Ibn Nūḥ's method of presenta-

[21] Aharon ben Asher was active in the first half of the tenth century, though the material that he assembled together in the *Diqduqe ha-Ṭeʿamim* was mostly composed by earlier generations of Masoretes; see Baer and Strack (1879, xvi), A. Dotan, *The Diqduqé Haṭṭĕʿamim of Aharon ben Moshe ben Ashér* (Jerusalem, 1967), 4.

[22] See Dotan, *Diqduqé*, 31.

tion is the explanation as to why a word has one particular form rather than another. This often involves comparing closely related forms that differ from the form that is under investgation only in small details. The issue that is addressed is why these fine distinctions in form exist. This may be compared to the practice of the Masoretes to collate words that were similar in form but differed only in details. This was a central feature of the masoretic method and lists recording these collations are found throughout the masoretic notes that were attached to Bible codices. The purpose of this was to draw attention to fine details of form to ensure that they were preserved in the transmission of Scripture. Collations of two closely related forms of word were also compiled in independent masoretic treatises, such as *ʾOḵlah we-ʾOḵlah*.[23] By the tenth century, the Masoretes also compiled treatises that formulated rules for the occurrence of some of these fine distinctions in form with regard to vowels and accents. The most famous work of this kind is the *Diqduqe ha-Ṭeʿamim* 'The rules of the details of the accents', which was compiled in the first half of the tenth century by Aharon ben Asher.[24]

As remarked, the *Diqduq* of Ibn Nūḥ was concerned principally with morphology. It was intended, it seems, to complement such treatises as *Diqduqe ha-Ṭeʿamim*, the exclusive concern of which was pronunciation and accents.

The grammatical activity denoted by the term *diqduq* in the early Karaite tradition, therefore, was closely associated with the work of the Tiberian Masoretes. This is further shown by an early text published by Allony (1964) that contains a list of technical terms for the various aspects of Biblical study. These are described in the text as *diqduqe ha-miqra*, which has the sense of 'the fine points of Scripture established by detailed investigation'. The list includes masoretic, grammatical and hermeneutical terms. These correspond closely to the terminology and concepts of Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq*. The range of the topics of analysis denoted by the terms also parallels the scope of analysis that is found in the *Diqduq*, though, as we

---

23 The treatise *ʾOḵlah we-ʾOḵlah* is named after the first two words of the first list ('eating' [I Sam. 1:9] 'and eat' [Gen. 27:19]), which enumerates pairs of words, one occurring with the conjunctive *waw* and the other without it. For a general discussion of the background of the text see Yeivin (1980: 128–131). An edition of the text based on the best manuscripts has been made by F. Díaz Esteban, *Sefer ʾOklah we-ʾOklah: colección de listas de palabras destinadas a conservar la integridad del texto hebreo de la Biblia entre los judios de la Edad Media*. Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 4, (Madrid, 1975) and B. Ognibeni, *La seconda parte del Sefer ʾOklah weʾOklah: edizione del ms. Halle, Universitätsbibliothek Y b 40 10, ff. 68–124*, (Madrid-Fribourg, 1995).

24 The definitive edition of this text is by Dotan, *Diqduqé*.

have remarked, the focus of the *Diqduq* is more on the grammatical and hermeneutical aspects than on the masoretic. It is more accurate to say that the masoretic works and Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq* combined cover the range of topics contained in the list. The Masora and the grammatical work of Ibn Nūḥ complement each other to establish the *diqduqe ha-miqra*. This list was not intended primarily as a foundation for the study of grammar per se, but rather as a methodology for establishing the correct interpretation of Scripture.

Allony, in his edition of this list of technical terms, claimed that it was of Karaite background. One should be cautious, however, of being too categorical on this issue. Certain details of its content suggest that it was composed in the early Islamic period. It would, therefore, come from a period when Karaism was in its embryonic stages of development. The main evidence that Allony cites for its being a Karaite work is the reference in the text to the 'masters of Bible study' (*baʿale ha-miqra*). This term was used in some texts in the Middle Ages to designate Karaites.[25] It is found, however, already in Rabbinic literature in the sense of 'those who study only the Bible and not the Mishnah or Gemara'.[26] It should be noted, moreover, that in masoretic texts it is sometimes used as an epithet of the Masoretes, who were professionally occupied with the investigation of the Bible.[27] The contents of the list were incorporated by a number of later authors into their works. These included not only Karaites but also Rabbanites, such as Dunaš ben Labraṭ.[28]

The fact that some of the grammatical terms found in Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq* are Hebrew is significant for the dating of the origins of the Karaite grammatical tradition. The list of *diqduqe ha-miqra* is entirely in Hebrew. This is in conformity with the use of Hebrew in masoretic works before the tenth century. The Hebrew technical terms of Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq* would be vestiges from this early period. Some of this Hebrew terminology can, in fact, be traced to Rabbinic texts.[29] It is clear, however, that the Karaite grammatical tradition also took over elements from Arabic grammatical

[25] It is used frequently in this way by the Karaites Salmon ben Yerumon and Judah Hadassi.

[26] Cf. Bacher, *Älteste Terminologie*, 118.

[27] E.g. S. Baer and H.L. Strack. *Die Dikduke ha-Tᵉamim des Ahron ben Moscheh ben Ascher und andere alte grammatisch-massorethische Lehrstücke*, (Leipzig, 1879), xxxviii.

[28] *Teshubot de Dunash ben Labrat*, ed. A. Sáenz-Badillos, Granada, (1980), 15*.

[29] See Bacher, *Die Anfänge der Hebräischen Grammatik*, (Leipzig, 1895a), 4; *Älteste Terminologie,* 99–100; Yeivin I. *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah* (trans. and ed. E.J. Revell), (Missoula, 1980), 116; Dotan, "De la Massora à la grammaire. Les débuts de la pensée grammaticale dans l'Hébreu," *Journal Asiatique*, 278 (1990), 27–28.

thought. The *Diqduq* of Ibn Nūḥ contains some Arabic technical terms. Moreover, many of the Hebrew terms that are found in the list of *diqduqe ha-miqra* and also in Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq* appear to be calques of Arabic terminology. R. Talmon (1998) has shown that some of the Arabic terms that correspond to the Hebrew of the list *diqduqe ha-miqra* are found in the earliest layers of the tradition of Arabic grammar and Qurʾānic exegesis in the eighth and ninth centuries. This early tradition differed from the tradition based on the teachings of Sībawayhi, which became the mainstream school in Arabic grammar after the ninth century. It is relevant to note that Arabic grammatical thought in its early stages was closely associated with Qurʾānic exegesis and only later became a distinct discipline.[30] This would parallel the association between grammar and exegesis reflected by the *diqduqe ha-miqra* list and also the fact that the *Diqduq* of Ibn Nūḥ has the structure of a Biblical commentary rather than a systematic description of grammar.

The *diqduqe ha-miqra* list and the masoretic treatises such as *Diqduqe ha-Ṭeʿamim* belong to the Tiberian Masoretic tradition. How are we to reconcile the proposed close relationship of the early Karaite grammatical tradition to the Tiberian Masora with the proposal that the Karaite grammatical tradition had its roots in the East in Iraq and Iran? The explanation is doubtless that the Tiberian masoretic tradition was not restricted to a local diffusion but rather was regarded as a prestigious tradition by Jewish scholars, Rabbanite and Karaite, throughout the Near East. The Karaite al-Qirqisānī writing in the first half of the tenth century in Iraq explicity states the superiority of the Tiberian tradition. There are references in medieval sources to the fact that scholars from Tiberias travelled long distances to teach the Tiberian tradition. Moreover scholars from the eastern communities of Iraq and Iran came into contact with the Tiberian masoretes by migration to Palestine. This applied to numerous Karaites, including Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ himself. It is also relevant to note that the masoretic material in early Tiberian Bible codices contains numerous elements originating in the Babylonian Masora (Ofer 2001: 260–274). This can be explained as a reflection of the migration of masoretes from East to West.

A few fragmentary texts are extant that are closely associated with Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq* and belong to the early Karaite grammatical tradition. We have already mentioned a Judaeo-Persian grammatical commentary,

[30] See C.H.M. Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar and Qurʾānic Exegesis in Early Islam* (Leiden, 1993).

which parallels the *Diqduq* both in grammatical theory and in structure. In addition to this, we have large fragments of an early Karaite grammatical text that is not in the form of a Biblical commentary but rather is a systematic classifications of the morphological patterns of Biblical Hebrew verbs and nouns.[31] This classification represents the core grammatical thought that developed within the early Karaite discipline of *diqduq*. The text is attributed to a certain Saʿīd. It is likely that this should be identified with the grammarian Saʿīd Shīrān, who was a pupil of Ibn Nūḥ.[32] The text exhibits many parallels with the grammatical work of Ibn Nūḥ, in its grammatical theory, terminology and argumentation. It consists of a series of chapters, each of which is devoted to verbs with imperative bases of one particular pattern. A full inventory is given of the verbs in each category, problematic issues are discussed and a complete paradigm of a representative verb is presented. In its overall structure, the treatise differs from Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq*, which, as we have seen, consists of grammatical notes on the Bible arranged in the order of the biblical verses. It, nevertheless, exhibits a similarity to the *Diqduq* in its method of discussing problematic issues. As is the case in the *Diqduq*, these discussions frequently offer a variety of different opinions concerning the derivation of a form. The fact that such attention is given to masāʾil indicates that the work was not intended as an elementary grammar of Hebrew. A distinctive feature of the text is the presentation of paradigms of verbs containing the various inflections. Full paradigms are given even of verbs that are of unique occurrence and appear prima facie to be anomalous, with all of their inflections being recovered by analogy. This applies, for example, to the unusual prefix conjugation form יִשְׁפּוּטְוּ *yišpūṭū́* 'they judge' (Exodus 18:26), which is not interpreted as an irregular variant form of the normal 3pl. prefix conjugation but rather part of a completely separate paradigm (imperative: שְׁפּוּטֵה *šəp̄ūṭē*, prefix conjugation: יִשְׁפּוּטֵה *yišpūṭē*, suffix conjugation: שְׁפּוּטִיתִי *šəp̄ūṭīṯī*).[33] Such apparently exceptional and anomalous forms are thereby shown to be entirely regular when the full potential system of the language is reconstructed.

[31] These two texts, together with the Judaeo-Persian grammatical text, are published in Khan, *Grammatical Texts*.

[32] Poznański, "Karaite Miscellanies." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 8 (Old Series), (1896a), 699; M. Steinschneider, *Die Arabische Literatur der Juden* (Frankfurt a.M, 1902), 89; Mann, *Jewish History*, 30.

[33] Cf. Khan, *Grammatical Texts*, 171.

2. The Grammatical Works of ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn and Dependent Treatises

ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn ibn Faraj lived in Jerusalem in the first half of the 11th century. According to the chronicler Ibn al-Hītī, he was the student of Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ and was attached to the Karaite college in Jerusalem. After the death of Ibn Nūḥ, ʾAbū al-Faraj took over the leadership of the college.[34]

ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn wrote several Arabic works on the Hebrew language. The largest of these is a comprehensive work on Hebrew morphology and syntax consisting of eight parts entitled *al-Kitāb al-Muštamil ʿalā al-ʾUṣūl wa-l-Fuṣūl fī al-Luġa al-ʿIbrāniyya* (‘The Comprehensive Book of General Principles and Particular Rules of the Hebrew Language’), which was completed in 1026 C.E.[35] This consisted of eight parts, which may have originally been produced as separate books. He composed a shorter version of the work called *al-Kitāb al-Kāfī fī al-Luġa al-ʿIbrāniyya* (‘The Sufficient Book on the Hebrew Language’).[36] The earliest known manuscript of this work has a colophon dated 1037 C.E.[37] *al-Kitāb al-Kāfī* had a much wider circulation than *al-Kitāb al-Muštamil*, judging by the large number

[34] Ibn al-Hītī, (ed. Margoliouth, “Arabic Chronicle,” 433).

[35] For a summary of the contents of the *al-Kitāb al-Muštamil* see Bacher, “Le grammairien anonyme de Jérusalem,” *Revue des Études Juives* 30 (1895b), 232–256, who published a few short extracts. Recent studies of aspects of grammar in *al-Kitāb al-Muštamil* have been published by Maman, המחשבה הדקדוקית בימי הביניים: בין הקראים לרבנים, *Language Studies* VII (1996a); (idem), המקור ושם הפעולה בתפיסת אבו אלפרג הארון, in M. Bar-Asher (ed.), *Studies in Hebrew and Jewish Languages Presented to Shelomo Morag*, Jerusalem (1996b) and “Karaite Hebrew Grammatical Thought—State of the Art.” In Carlos del Valle, Santiago García-Jalón and Juan Pedro Monferrer (eds.), Maimónides y su época, Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, (2007), and Basal “Part one of *al-Kitāb al-Mushtamil* by ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn and its dependence on Ibn al-Sarrāj’s *Kitāb al-ʾUṣūl fī al-Naḥw*,” *Lĕshonénu* 61 (1998); “The concept of *ḥāl* in the *al-Kitāb al-Mushtamil* of ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn in comparison with Ibn al-Sarrāj,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 19 (1999).

[36] A full edition and English translation of *al-Kitāb al-Kāfī* has been published G. Khan, M.A. Gallego and J. Olszowy-Schlanger (2003). Previous studies of the work include Skoss (1928, introduction 11–27), Gil (1983, vol. 1, section 938, and the references cited there). Extracts from *al-Kitāb al-Kāfī* had been published previously by S. Poznański, “Aboul-Faradj Haroun,” M.N. Zislin, “Glava iz grammatičyeskovo sočinyeniya al-Kafi Abu-l-Faradža Xaruna ibn al-Faradža,” *Palyestinskiy Sbornik* 7 (1962), “Abu-l-Faradž Xarun o spryažyenii Evreyskovo glagola,” *Kratkiye Soobshčyeniya Instityta Harodov Azii*, 86 (1964), N. Allony, ספר קולות (כתאב אלמצוותאת): קטע חדש מגניזות קהיר, *Lĕshonénu* 47 (1983), and D. Becker שטת הסימנים של דרכי הפועל העברי לפי המדקדקים הקראים אבו אלפרג הארון ובעל מאור עין in M.A. Friedman (ed.), *Studies in Judaica*, Te’udah 7, Tel-Aviv, 1991.

[37] II Firk. Evr. Arab. I 4601, fol. 107a. A note in the margin of fol. 110a indicates that the manuscript was the property of the author’s two sons, Faraj and Yehudah.

of extant manuscripts containing the work. We have a few fragments of a text that appears to be an epitome of *al-Kitāb al-Kāfī*.

A further work of ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn, which has survived in various manuscript fragments, is an introductory treatise on grammar entitled *Kitāb al-Madḫal ʾilā ʿIlm al-Diqduq fī Ṭuruq al-Luġa al-ʿIbrāniyya* ('Book of Introduction into the Discipline of Careful Investigation of the Ways of the Hebrew Language'). According to the preface of this text, ʾAbū al-Faraj wrote it after his completion of *al-Kitāb al-Muštamil* and *al-Kitāb al-Kāfī*. The work includes a discussion of the terminology that was used by the earlier Karaite grammarians. These include many of the Hebrew terms that are found in the *Diqduq* of Ibn Nūḥ and related early texts but not used by ʾAbū al-Faraj himself in in his own grammatical works.[38]

Most of the grammatical works of ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn are systematically arranged studies of the Hebrew language as an independent discipline. He, indeed, sometimes goes beyond a description of specifically Hebrew grammar and discusses general principles of human language. In some sections of his works he addresses philosophical issues such as the origin of language and its nature.[39] The perspective of these works, therefore, differs from that of Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq*, the primary purpose of which was the investigation of Scripture by grammatical analysis and the demonstration of the logical structure of the language of Scripture. His comprehensive approach to grammar contrasts with Ibn Nūḥ's practice of concentrating on the problematic issues (*masāʾil, nukat*). Another divergence from the approach of Ibn Nūḥ is the categorical approach of ʾAbū al-Faraj. He rarely presents alternative opinions.

ʾAbū al-Faraj refers to the grammarians of earlier generations such as Ibn Nūḥ as *al-diqdūqiyyūna*. He did not use the term *diqdūqiyyūna* to designate all people engaged in the study of grammar. He makes an explicit terminological distinction between the Arabic grammarians (*al-nuḥā*) and the early Karaite Hebrew grammarians (*al-diqdūqiyyūna*).[40] Moreover, the way he uses the term *diqdūqiyyūna* in his writings implies that they were a set of scholars distinct from himself and that he did not regard himself

---

[38] A large section of this work has been preserved in II Firk. Evr. Arab. I 4601, fol. 110a ff.

[39] For the views of the medieval Karaites on the origin and nature of language see Olszowy-Schlanger, "Karaite linguistics: The "Renaissance" of the Hebrew language among early Karaite Jews, and contemporary linguistic theories," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*, 7 (1997) and *Karaite Marriage Documents from the Cairo Genizah. Legal Tradition and Community Life in Mediaeval Egypt and Palestine*. (Leiden, 1998), 87–97.

[40] See Khan, "ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn," 318, for discussion of the relevant passages.

as one of their number.[41] There was, nevertheless, a certain degree of continuity of grammatical thought from the teachings of the *diqdūqiyyūna* in the works of ʾAbū al-Faraj. He was, indeed, the student of Ibn Nūḥ and took over some elements of his master's teaching into the edifice of his own work. This relationship between master and student is reflected in the exegetical commentary of Ibn Nūḥ on the Pentateuch which was adapted by ʾAbū al-Faraj. As shown by Miriam Goldstein, in this adaptation the original text of Ibn Nūḥ is interwoven with the elaborations, clarifications and sometimes the criticisms of the student.

The primary purpose of ʾAbū al-Faraj in his grammatical works was the systematic investigation of the language, whereas the main objective of some of the earlier Karaite grammarians, such as Ibn Nūḥ, was the elucidation of the problematic grammatical details of Scripture. As we have seen, attempts were made already by certain circles of Karaite grammarians before the time of ʾAbū al-Faraj to systematize grammatical knowledge. This consisted mainly in the classification of verbs and nouns according to their patterns and inflections. These treatises, however, lacked the scope of the grammatical works of ʾAbū al-Faraj.

ʾAbū al-Faraj follows closely the approach to grammar that had been adopted by most Arabic grammarians of his time. This was the approach of the so-called Baṣran school of Arabic grammarians, which had become the mainstream tradition by the 10th century. The dependence of ʾAbū al-Faraj on the Baṣran tradition is seen in the scope of his works, in his grammatical theory and in his Arabic technical terminology. Much of the terminology of the earlier Karaite tradition, by contrast, was Hebrew. One example of this relating to grammatical theory is his claim that the derivational base of verbs is the infinitive rather than the imperative form. As we have seen, the derivation of verbs from the imperative was a central feature of the earlier Karaite grammatical theory. Unlike Ibn Nūḥ's work, it is clear that ʾAbū al-Faraj's work draws on written sources belonging to the Arabic grammatical tradition, and indeed his sources can be identified.[42] It is important to note, however, that ʾAbū al-Faraj's comprehensive work

[41] E.g. *al-kalām fīmā yaḏkuruhu al-diqdūqiyyūna fī al-ʾawāmir* 'Discussion of the statement of the *diqduq* scholars concerning imperatives' (*al-Kitāb al-Kāfī*, in Khan 1997: 318).

[42] Becker "A Unique Semantic Classification of the Hebrew Verb Taken by the Qaraite ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn from the Arab Grammarian ʾIbn al-Sarrāj," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 20, (1996), Basal, "Part one of *al-Kitāb* al-Mushtamil by ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn and its dependence on Ibn al-Sarrāj's *Kitāb* al-ʾUṣūl fī al-Naḥw." *Lĕshonénu* 61 (1998) and "The concept of *ḥāl* in the *al-Kitāb* al-Mushtamil of ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn in comparison with Ibn al-Sarrāj." *Israel Oriental Studies* 19 (1999).

on grammar *al-Kitāb al-Muštamil* and its short version *al-Kitāb al-Kāfī* are concerned principally with morphology and syntax. They do not contain treatments of the Masoretic reading tradition. ʾAbū al-Faraj composed a separate work on biblical reading called *Hidāyat al-Qāriʾ* ('Guide for the Reader'), which has been preserved in a long version and various shorter versions.[43] It presents a description of the pronunciation of the consonants and vowels in the Tiberian reading tradition as well as the system of accents. This dichotomy between grammar (morphology and syntax) and biblical reading in the works of ʾAbū al-Faraj can be regarded as a feature of continuity from the earlier Karaite tradition. One should contrast this with the grammatical work of Saadya Gaon, *Kitāb Faṣīḥ Luġat al-ʿIbrāniyyīna* 'The Book of the Eloquence of the Language of the Hebrews', which contains extensive treatment of various features of the Masoretic reading tradition, the source of much of which can be identified in extant Masoretic treatises such as *Diqduqe ha-Ṭeʿamim.*[44]

A number of other medieval Karaite grammatical works are extant that are largely dependent on the writings of ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn and were written in the eleventh century. One such work is the grammatical treatise written in Hebrew known as *Meʾor ʿAyin* that has been published by M.N. Zislin (Moscow, 1990) on the basis of a single surviving manuscript.[45] The text was written by an anonymous author in Byzantium some time during the second half of the eleventh century. According to the colophon, the manuscript was written in 1208 in the town of Gagra. The work is largely derivative from the works of ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn, especially, it seems, *al-Kitāb al-Kāfī*. Some elements, however, are drawn directly from the early Karaite grammatical tradition. An Arabic grammatical work that is closely related to *Meʾor ʿAyin* is *Kitāb al-ʿUqūd fī Taṣārīf al-Luġa al-ʿIbrāniyya* ('Book of the Connections with regard to the Grammatical Inflections of the Hebrew Language'). This work was erroneously identified by Hirschfeld as being by ʾAbū al-Faraj himself.[46] An important advance in the reconstructon of the Karaite grammatical corpus was

[43] For a detailed study of this text see I. Eldar, *The Study of the Art of Correct Reading as Reflected in the Medieval Treatise Hidāyat al-Qāri* (=Guidance of the Reader), Jerusalem (1994).

[44] Dotan, *The Dawn of Hebrew Linguistics: The Book of Elegance of the Language of the Hebrews*. 2 vols. (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies 1997), 34–36.

[45] II Firk. Evr. IIA 1321. An important contribution to the assessment of this text is made by A. Maman in his review of the edition of Zislin, *Lĕshonénu* 58 (1994).

[46] H. Hirschfeld, "An Unknown Grammatical Work by Abul-Faraj Harun," Jewish *Quarterly Review*, New Series 13 (1922–23), 1–7.

recently made by Nadia Vidro, who has demonstrated that the fragment published by Hirschfeld that contains the title *Kitāb al-ʿUqūd* is the beginning of a work dealing principally with verbal inflections that exists in various manuscripts and is to be attributed to an anonymous author who was the contemporary of ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn.[47] A feature of *Meʾor ʿAyin* and *Kitāb al-ʿUqūd* is the classification of verbal forms by mnemonic catchwords (see Nadia Vidro's article in this volume). This system of classification is also found in the works of ʾAbū al-Faraj. It is not found in the earlier work of Ibn Nūḥ, but according to ʾAbū al-Faraj it was originally developed by one of the earlier *diqduqiyyūna* (*Kitāb al-Kāfī* I.22.1.). The use of such mnemonic devices, which are generally referred to by the Hebrew term siman or the corresponding Arabic text ʿalāma, is reminiscent of the use of mnemonics for abbreviated reference in the Masoretic tradition, also known as simanim.

In addition, several fragments are extant in various collections that contain grammatical technical terms and a methodological presentation that are characteristic of Karaite grammatical works but appear to belong to different works from those mentioned above. These fragments give us some indication of the extensive nature of the corpus of Karaite grammatical literature in the Middle Ages.

As far as we can establish in our present state of knowledge, the Karaite grammatical tradition, which had exhibited such creativity in the tenth and eleventh centuries, became virtually defunct in the twelfth century. Manuscripts of the medieval works, especially those of ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn, continued to be copied in later centuries. It appears, however, that little original contribution to Hebrew grammatical thought was made by Karaites in the later Middle Ages. The Karaite Judah Hadassi, for example, who was active in Byzantium in the twelfth century, presents a section on Hebrew grammar in his *ʾEškol ha-Kopher* that is dependent on the system of the Spanish grammarians Ḥayyūj and Ibn Janāḥ.[48] The same applied to the fate of medieval Karaite lexicography, which is not considered in detail in this paper. In the 10th and 11th centuries Karaite scholars such David ben Abraham al-Fāsī and ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn made important contributions to this field. In the later Middle Ages, however, Karaites appear to be heavily dependent on Rabbanite lexicographical works. This is

[47] See Vidro, "A Newly Reconstructed Karaite Work On Hebrew Grammar," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 54 (2009a) and A medieval Karaite treatise on Hebrew grammar, Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2009b.
[48] See Maman (1996a), 95–96.

demonstrated by the lexicographical work *al-Taysīr*, written by the Karaite Solomon ibn Mubarrak ibn Ṣaʿīr at the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century, identified among the Firkovitch manuscripts by José Martínez Delgado, which is mainly based on Rabbanite sources.[49]

Only limited knowledge of the medieval Karaite grammatical works was transmitted to the West. This applied especially to the works of the early Karaite grammatical tradition. Some of the medieval Hebrew grammarians of Spain were aware of *al-Kitāb al-Muštamil* by ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn, but this work did not make any clearly recognizable impression on the Western tradition of Hebrew grammar, which has predominated down to the present.

References

Primary Sources

Delgado, J.M. *Libro de la facilitación Kitab At-Taysir: diccionario judeo-árabe de hebreo bíblico*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2010.

Dotan, A. *The Diqduqé Haṭṭĕʿamim of Aharon ben Moshe ben Ashér*. Jerusalem, 1967 [in Hebrew].

Díaz Esteban, F. *Sefer ʾOklah we-ʾOklah: colección de listas de palabras destinadas a conservar la integridad del texto hebreo de la Biblia entre los judios de la Edad Media*. Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 4. Madrid, 1975.

Gindin, T. *The Early Judaeo-Persian Tafsīrs of Ezekiel: Text, Translation, Commentary*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007.

Hadassi, Judah, *ʾEshkol ha-Kop̄er*. Gozlow, 1836.

Khan, G. *The Early Karaite Tradition of Hebrew Grammatical Thought: Including a Critical Edition, Translation and Analysis of the Diqduq of ʾAbū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ*. Leiden, 2000a.

——, *Early Karaite Grammatical Texts*. Atlanta, 2000b.

Khan, G., M.A. Gallego and J. Olszowy-Schlanger. *The Karaite Tradition of Hebrew Grammatical Thought in its Classical Form: A Critical Edition and English Translation of al-Kitab al-Kafi fi al-Lugha al-ʿIbrāniyya by Abu al-Faraj Harun ibn al-Faraj*. Leiden, Brill, 2003.

Margoliouth, G. "Ibn al-Hītī's Arabic Chronicle of Karaite Doctors." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 9 (1897): 429–444.

Nemoy, L. (ed.) *Al-Qirqisānī: Kitāb al-ʾanwār w-al-marāqib*. 5 vols., New York, 1939–45.

Ognibeni, B. *La seconda parte del Sefer ʾOklah weʾOklah: edizione del ms. Halle, Universitätsbibliothek Y b 40 10, ff. 68–124*. Madrid-Fribourg, 1995.

Sáenz-Badillos, A. (ed.), *Teshubot de Dunash ben Labrat. Edición crítica y traducción espanola*. Granada-Salamanca, 1980.

[49] This important text has recently been published by J.M. Delgado, *Libro de la facilitación Kitab At-Taysir: diccionario judeo-árabe de hebreo bíblico* (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2010).

Secondary Sources

Allony, N. רשימת מונחים קראית מהמאה השמינית in כתבי החברה לחקר המקרא בישראל לזכר ד״ר י.פ. קורנגרין ז״ל, edited by A. Wieser and B.Z. Luria, 324–63. Tel-Aviv, 1964.

——, ספר קולות (כתאב אלמצוותאת): קטע חדש מגניזות קהיר, *Lĕshonénu* 47 (1983): 85–124.

Bacher, W. *Die Anfänge der Hebräischen Grammatik*. Leipzig, 1895a.

——, “Le grammairien anonyme de Jérusalem.” *Revue des Études Juives* 30 (1895b): 232–256.

——, *Die Älteste Terminologie der Jüdischen Schriftauslegung. Ein Wörterbuch der Bibelexegetischen Kunstsprachen der Tannaiten*, Leipzig, 1899.

Baer, S. and Strack, H.L. *Die Dikduke ha-Teamim des Ahron ben Moscheh ben Ascher und andere alte grammatisch-massorethische Lehrstücke*. Leipzig, 1879.

Basal, N., “Part one of *al-Kitāb al-Mushtamil* by ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn and its dependence on Ibn al-Sarrāj’s *Kitāb al-ʾUṣūl fī al-Naḥw*.” *Lĕshonénu* 61 (1998): 191–209.

——, “The concept of *ḥāl* in the *al-Kitāb al-Mushtamil* of ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn in comparison with Ibn al-Sarrāj.” *Israel Oriental Studies* 19 (1999): 391–408.

Becker, D. שטת הסימנים של דרכי הפועל העברי לפי המדקדקים הקראים אבו אלפרג הארון ובעל מאיר עין in *Studies in Judaica*, Te’udah 7, edited by M.A. Friedman 249–75, Tel-Aviv, 1991.

——, “A Unique Semantic Classification of the Hebrew Verb Taken by the Qaraite ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn from the Arab Grammarian ʾIbn al-Sarrāj.” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 20, (1996): 237–259.

Dotan, A., “De la Massora à la grammaire. Les débuts de la pensée grammaticale dans l’Hébreu.” *Journal Asiatique*, 278 (1990): 13–30.

——, *The Dawn of Hebrew Linguistics: The Book of Elegance of the Language of the Hebrews*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1997.

Dozy, R., *Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes*. 3rd edition. 2 vols. Leiden: Paris, 1967.

Eldar, I. *The Study of the Art of Correct Reading as Reflected in the Medieval Treatise Hidāyat al-Qāri* (=Guidance of the Reader). Jerusalem, 1994. [in Hebrew]

Gil, M., *Palestine during the First Muslim Period (634–1099)*, Tel-Aviv, 1983.

Goldstein, M., The Pentateuch exegesis of the Karaites Yusuf ibn Nūḥ and ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn: an examination of method in the context of the contemporaneous literary and exegetical approaches of Jews, Christians and Muslims, Ph.D. thesis, Jerusalem, Hebrew University, 2006.

Harviainen, T. “Abraham Firkovitsh, Karaites in Hīt, and the provenance of Karaite transcriptions of Biblical Hebrew texts in Arabic script.” In *Studies in Memory of Andrej Czapkiewicz, 1*. Folia Orientalia 28, Wroclaw, Warszawa and KrakoÏw, 1991:179–191.

——, “The Cairo Genizot and other sources of the second Firkovich collection in St. Petersburg.” In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of the International Organization for Masoretic Studies,* edited by E.J. Revell, 25–36, Atlanta, 1996.

——, “Abraham Firkovich and the Karaite community in Jerusalem in 1864.” *Manuscripta Orientalia* 4/2. Russian Academy of Sciences. The Institute of Oriental Studies. St. Petersburg Branch, (1998): 66–70.

Hirschfeld, H. “An Unknown Grammatical Work by Abul-Faraj Harun.” *Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series 13 (1922–23): 1–7.

Kahle, P. *Masoreten des Westens*. Stuttgart, 1927–1930.

Khan, G. “ʾAbū al-Faraj Hārūn and the early Karaite grammatical tradition.” *The Journal of Jewish Studies* 48 (1997): 314–34.

——, “Biblical exegesis and grammatical theory in the Karaite tradition.” In *Exegesis and Grammar in Medieval Karaite Texts*, edited by G. Khan, 127–149. Oxford, 2001.

——, “Conjoining according to medieval Karaite grammatical theory.” In *Shaʿarei Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher*, edited by A. Maman, S. Fassberg and Y. Breuer, *117–*31. Jerusalem: Bialik, 2007.

Maman, A. Review of Zislin (1990), *Lĕshonénu* 58 (1994): pp.153–65.
——, המחשבה הדקדוקית בימי הביניים: בין הקראים לרבנים, *Language Studies* VII (1996a): 79–96.
——, המקור ושם הפעולה בתפיסת אבו אלפרג הארון. In *Studies in Hebrew and Jewish Languages Presented to Shelomo Morag*, edited by M. Bar-Asher, 119–49. Jerusalem, 1996b.
——, "Karaite Hebrew Grammatical Thought—State of the Art." In *Maimónides y su época*, edited by C. del Valle, S. García-Jalón and J.P. Monferrer, 429–438. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 2007.
Mann, J. *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, vol. II, Philadelphia, 1935.
Ofer, Y. *The Babylonian Masora of the Pentateuch: Its Principles and Methods*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 2001.
Olszowy-Schlanger, "Karaite linguistics: The "Renaissance" of the Hebrew language among early Karaite Jews, and contemporary linguistic theories." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*, 7 (1997): 81–100.
——, *Karaite Marriage Documents from the Cairo Genizah. Legal Tradition and Community Life in Mediaeval Egypt and Palestine*. Leiden, 1998.
Pinsker, S. *Lickute Kadmoniot. Zur Geschichte des Karaismus und der karäischen Literatur*. Wien, 1860.
Poznański, S. "Karaite Miscellanies." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 8 (Old Series), (1896a): 681–704.
——, "Aboul-Faradj Haroun ben al-Faradj le grammarien de Jérusalem et son Mouschtamil." *Revue des Études Juives*, 30 (1896b): 24–39, 197–213.
Skoss, S.L. *The Arabic Commentary of ʿAli ben Suleimān the Karaite on the Book of Genesis*. Philadelphia, 1928.
Steinschneider, M. *Die Arabische Literatur der Juden*. Frankfurt a.M, 1902.
Talmon, R. "A reappraisal of the "List of ancient Hebrew terms" and the affiliation between Hebrew and Arabic." In *ʿEver and ʿArav: Contacts between Arabic Literature and Jewish Literature in the Middle Ages and Modern Times*, edited by Y. Tobi, 27–51. Tel-Aviv, 1998.
Versteegh, C.H.M. *Arabic Grammar and Qurʾānic Exegesis in Early Islam*. Leiden, 1993.
Vidro, N. "A Newly Reconstructed Karaite Work On Hebrew Grammar." *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 54 (2009a): 169–178.
——, A medieval Karaite treatise on Hebrew grammar, Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2009b.
Yeivin, I. *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah* (trans. and ed. E.J. Revell), Missoula, 1980.
Zislin, M.N. "Glava iz grammatičyeskovo sočinyeniya al-Kafi Abu-l-Faradža Xaruna ibn al-Faradža." *Palyestinskiy Sbornik* 7 (1962): 178–84.
——, "Abu-l-Faradž Xarun o spryažyenii Evreyskovo glagola." *Kratkiye Soobshčyeniya Instityta Harodov Azii*, 86 (1964): 164–77.
——, (ed.), *Meʾor ʿAyin*. Moscow, 1990.

SUBJECT INDEX

INDEX OF NAMES